This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

ARTES
SCIENTIA
VERITAS
LIBRARY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
SI QUAERIS PENINSULAM AMOENAM
CIRCUMSPICE

BS
410
.E96

THE EXPOSITOR.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THE EXPOSITOR.

THE VERY REV. THE DEAN OF CANTERBURY.
REV. CANON FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S.
REV. CANON PEROWNE, D.D.
REV. PROFESSOR PLUMPTRE, M.A., D.D.
REV. W. SANDAY, M.A.
REV. J. RAWSON LUMBY, B.D.
REV. RAYNER WINTERBOTHAM, M.A., B.Sc.
REV. PROFESSOR STANLEY LEATHES, M.A.
REV. PRINCIPAL TULLOCH, D.D.
REV. PROFESSOR ALEX. ROBERTS, D.D.
REV. JAMES MORISON, D.D.
REV. J. OSWALD DYKES, D.D.
REV. PROFESSOR A. B. DAVIDSON, M.A.
REV. PROFESSOR A. B. BRUCE, D.D.
REV. PROFESSOR W. MILLIGAN, D.D.
REV. PROFESSOR W. ROBERTSON SMITH, M.A.
REV. PROFESSOR A. M. FAIRBAIRN.
REV. PROFESSOR D. W. SIMON, M.A.
REV. PROFESSOR H. R. REYNOLDS, D.D.
REV. HENRY BURTON, M.A.
REV. R. W. DALE, M.A.
REV. A. MACLAREN, D.D.
REV. HENRY ALLON, D.D.
REV. ALEX. RALEIGH, D.D.

THE

EXPOSITOR.

EDITED BY THE REV.

SAMUEL COX.

VOLUME VI.

London:
HODDER & STOUGHTON
27, PATERNOSTER ROW.
MDCCCLXXVII.

The Gresham Press:
UNWIN BROTHERS, PRINTERS, CHILWORTH AND LONDON.

THE EXPOSITOR.

THE HOLINESS OF JESUS CHRIST.

THE Supernatural, in its most elevated form, is not miracle—it is holiness. In miracle we behold Omnipotence breaking forth to act in the physical world in the service of moral order. Holiness is moral goodness itself, in its most sublime manifestation.

What is the absolute good? It has lately been said, with an accuracy which leaves nothing to be desired, "The absolute good is not an entity or a thing. It is an order determining the relations of things—relations which are to be realized by the action of free wills." [1]

The perfect good is therefore the realization, at once normal and free, of the true relations between all beings; each creature, in virtue of this relative state, occupying that position in the great whole and performing that part which is fitting for him.

Now, as in a human family there is one central relationship upon which all the others depend—that of the father to each member of the little community, so in the universe is there one supreme position which constitutes the support of all the others, and which, in the interest of all creatures, should be

[1] Ernest Naville, *Le problème du mal*, p. 17.

253664

guarded before all else—that of God. And in the general sphere of goodness, the place of the special province of holiness is just here.

Holiness in God Himself consists in his immutable will to preserve intact the order which should exist amongst all creatures, and to bring them all to realize the relation which should unite them to each other; consequently, before all else, to maintain the integrity and dignity of his own position in the face of free beings. Holiness, thus understood, includes two things:—the communication by God of all the wealth of his divine life to every free being who shall consent to recognize his sovereign position, and sincerely acquiesce in it; the denial at first of this perfect life to, or the withdrawal of it afterwards from, every creature who attacks or denies this position, and who endeavours to break that bond of dependence which should unite it to God.

Holiness, in a created being, consists in its voluntary acquiescence in the supreme position of God. The man who, with all his power, affirms God to be the absolute, the only self-existent, Being; the man who in his presence voluntarily abases himself in the feeling of his own nothingness, and endeavours to draw all his fellows into the same state of voluntary self-suppression, is invested with the true characteristics of holiness.

This holiness includes in his case, as it does in God, love and righteousness: love, by which he joyfully acknowledges God and all the creatures which surround him as placed where they are by God—he loves them, and wills their existence, because he loves and wills both God and all that God loves and wills;

and righteousness, by which he respects, and, as much as in him lies, causes to be respected, God and the province assigned by God to each created being. Such is holiness in God and in man: in God, the immutable affirmation of Himself; in man, the unvarying affirmation of God.

This supreme goodness has been wanting among the heathen. The Divine Being was not understood among them in such a way that He could occupy so high a position in their consciousness. Their gods were not worthy to stand in such a relation to men. In Israel there was a presentiment and an imperfect realization of holiness. For Jehovah was there recognized as the Being of beings, and man was enabled in self-humiliation to reach to the feeling of his own nothingness before Him. But it was never actually realized save in Jesus Christ, and it is only from his person and history that we gather our ideal of holiness. It is in Jesus that mankind perceives how it is possible for us to affirm God and all that God affirms, not only in humility, but in joyfulness and in the spirit of sonship, with all the powers of our being, even to the complete sacrifice of ourselves.

In Christ, man became, by the annihilation and voluntary dedication of himself, a medium sufficiently transparent to allow the glory of God to shine forth in him in perfection. Thus it was that the life of Christ was the advent of the kingdom of God.

But here the question arises: Was this self-dedication of Christ to God really perfect? Was it in no degree alloyed by human imperfection, by sin, selfishness, evil desires, pride, impatience? Did it retain

its integrity in every moment of his life, from the manger to the cross? Was the body of Jesus always completely subject to his soul, and his soul, with all its faculties, always completely subject to the spirit—that higher principle, through the instrumentality of which man communicates with God, and subordinates himself voluntarily to Him? This is the question upon which we are now about to enter. It is a vital one for Christianity. For if we cannot answer it in the affirmative, Christ differs from us only in degree, and we are called to live *like* Him but not by Him. But if we can so answer it, his condition differs in kind from ours, and in order to be like Him, we must begin by tracing our being *in* Him and *from* Him.

Three principal objections are commonly raised against this fundamental truth of the Christian faith.

1. It is impossible to affirm with certainty the perfect holiness of Christ, because neither we ourselves nor those who lived with Him have had the power to read his heart deeply enough to know whether everything passed in it in conformity with the absolute Law of Right. The adversaries of our faith even cite certain words and actions in the life of Jesus, from which they claim the right to infer that He too was not exempt from sin.

2. Supposing that the perfect holiness of Christ could in some way be demonstrated, we are then met with the objection that so lofty a condition is something superhuman, and that this perfect Jesus would be no longer a true man.

3. A holiness different in nature from ours, even if it were real, would be useless to us, since it could

not serve as a model for us, moving, as it would, at a height inaccessible to our weakness.

In presence of these objections, my business will be to inquire: (1) Whether the perfect holiness of Jesus Christ cannot still, even in our day, be positively *demonstrated?* (2) Whether, perfect as it is, it does not remain, nevertheless, a *human* holiness? (3) Whether, as such, it is not still *accessible* to every one among us?

I.

"Are we in a position," asks M. Pécaut, "to pronounce a verdict of perfection upon the character of one of our fellow-creatures, when we do not know all the specialities of his life, and cannot reach to the depths of his heart? . . . The difficulty is enhanced if the subject of our investigations is an historical personage separated from us by eighteen centuries."[1]

Who could have believed that we should ever arrive at measuring the distance which separates the earth from the moon, from the sun, from the fixed stars, without quitting the surface of our globe? Nevertheless we have done so. It was only necessary to measure upon the earth's surface a base and two angles, and the problem was solved with all the strictness of mathematical evidence. We can obtain a result not less certain with regard to the problem now before us by an analogous method. By means of two incontrovertible facts, and of a principle which

[1] *Le Christ et la Conscience*, p. 237. A few paragraphs in which Professor Godet states and answers some petty objections to the character of Christ are here omitted. As these objections seem "frivolous" even to such critics as Dr. Keim, it can hardly be worth while to expend time and space in refuting them. —EDITOR.

unites them, we shall succeed in demonstrating the perfect holiness of Christ.

The first of the two facts to which we refer is the *relative* holiness of Jesus. Those even who dispute his absolute perfection do not deny that He was one of the best, if not the best, amongst men.

We may cite at this point the testimony of the contemporaries of Jesus, which though certainly insufficient to demonstrate his absolute holiness, does nevertheless suffice to prove his relative purity and goodness. The declaration of Pilate, his judge, "I find no fault in this man;" the confession of his companion in suffering, "We receive the due reward of our deeds, but this man hath done nothing amiss;" the exclamation of the Roman centurion who had presided at his execution, "Certainly this was a righteous man;" the despairing cry of the traitorous disciple who had delivered Him up, "I have betrayed innocent blood"—all these sayings reveal to us clearly enough the impression made by Jesus upon all those who found themselves brought into relation with Him.

We also know the impression which his life produced upon his intimate friends, who had observed Him closely for three years. One of them calls Him simply, "Jesus Christ the righteous;" another, "The Lamb without blemish and without spot." [1]

The attachment even to death which they entertain towards Him, the office of Mediator and Advocate which they assign Him between the holy God and their guilty souls, prove that in their eyes Jesus was at any rate the best of men, a man with-

[1] 1 John ii. 1; 1 Pet. i. 19.

out sin. No doubt they had not seen everything; their sight could not pierce to the secret purposes of the heart; but this impression produced upon them all leaves no doubt in our mind as to the eminent moral qualities of the life and of the mind of Jesus. His teaching itself, the ideal of purity which is there presented to us, the law of charity inculcated in it, are also proofs of the personal character of Him who so speaks. None but a good man could so wonderfully discern and reveal that which is good. So much as this, Strauss himself, the greatest enemy Christianity has had to encounter in our time, acknowledges, and expresses in the following words. After having cited that sublime passage in the Sermon on the Mount in which Jesus pictures the heavenly Father making his sun to shine on the evil and on the good, and sending rain on the just and on the unjust, he adds: "This ideal of a God good to all men, Jesus could only have drawn from his own consciousness; it could only be an emanation from that universal benevolence which was the fundamental feature of his own nature, and in virtue of which He felt Himself in perfect harmony with God. To withstand, like God Himself, the provocation caused by wickedness, to vanquish an enemy solely by beneficence, and to overcome evil with good only—these were principles which He drew from the character of his own heart. He pictured God to Himself such as He felt Himself to be in the best moments of his life. The ruling characteristic of his own being was a love which comprehended all creatures, and He makes of this the fundamental characteristic of the Divine essence." [1]

[1] *Leben Jesu*, 1864, pp. 206, 207.

Again, the same author says, in the chapter with which he concludes his work: "Every man eminent for morality, every thinker who has occupied himself with the moral activity of man, has contributed, within a sphere more or less wide, to the purification, the completion, the development of the ideal of morality. Amongst the personages to whom mankind is indebted for the perfecting of its moral conscience, Jesus occupies at any rate the highest place. He has introduced into our ideal of goodness some features in which it was deficient before He appeared. By the religious direction which He impressed upon morality, He gave it a higher consecration; and, by incarnating goodness in his own person, He imparted to it a living warmth. With reference to all that bears upon the love of God and of our neighbour, upon purity of heart and upon the individual life, nothing can be added to the moral intuition which Jesus Christ has left us." [1]

You see that if I call Jesus one of the best of men, I shall not come under any suspicion of partiality. The acknowledgments made by Strauss, which I have just quoted, could only have been extorted from him by the irresistible force of historical truth.

This is the fact upon which we take our stand in this argument; it is conceded by the most declared enemy of Christianity: — Jesus was a man pre-eminently good. But between that and a state of perfect holiness there is, no doubt, a wide gulf to be passed over. Can we cross it? Yes; and it is a principle to which moral experience conducts us which shall

[1] *Leben Jesu*, 1864, p. 625 *et seq.*

serve us for a bridge. The principle is this,—The more holy a man is, the more clearly does he discern evil. The nearer he lives to God, the better does he recognize, the more vividly does he feel, everything that separates between him and God.

At every step of progress which we make in goodness, our conscience gains a keener sagacity in detecting sin, and our heart a greater honesty in deploring it. You can all ascertain for yourselves at any moment the truth of this law of our moral nature. A child who has become used to lying, at last lies without being conscious of it, and without feeling any regret for it; whilst upon the conscience of a truthful child the first lie prints itself like a red-hot iron, and burns a deep wound. A girl who is light-minded, and given up only to her pleasure, absents herself from her mother from morning to night, following her plans and her pursuits, and yet she would be quite astonished if some one who had observed her conduct came to her in the evening to tell her that she had cause to reproach herself; while another who is devoted to her duties, will, on account of a mere act of heedlessness, or of a hasty word uttered to one of her companions, which others may not even have noticed, shed in solitude bitter tears, and refuse to forgive herself.

The more high-principled a merchant is, the deeper will be the uneasiness he will feel under the sense of the slightest act of injustice into which he may have fallen; while the most unprincipled speculations do not cost a sigh to him who has accustomed himself to cross without scruple the boundary lines of ordinary honesty. A man who has made any progress

in the life of holiness will not fail to take notice of every sinful thought, of every movement of self-love which comes across his mind; while a man less advanced will live from morning to night under the dominion of pride, of jealousy, or of some other evil passion, without even suspecting it.

Thousands of stains may pass unnoticed upon a garment already soiled, while on a perfectly pure garment the slightest spot draws attention. Strauss has himself given expression to this law in the following words: "In proportion as a man advances in moral perfection, does the inner sense, by which he perceives the slightest deviation from it in himself, become keener." [1]

What is the result of all this with reference to the subject now before us? It is that if Jesus was one of the best or the best of all men, He must have perceived more clearly than any one else the slightest evil existing within Him, supposing that evil really to exist. In vain would sin have hidden itself within the deepest recesses of his heart; in vain would it have been reduced within that heart to a minimum; still that conscience, clear-sighted and delicate as none other, would not have failed to have apprehended it as it passed, and that sensitive and filial heart would have suffered from it more than ours have ever suffered from the greatest sins.

Well—and this brings us to the other fact upon which we rest our case,—Is this what we find in the life and in the sayings of Jesus? Does He ever accuse Himself of the slightest sin? Do we ever see in his eyes one of those tears of penitence which

[1] *Leben Jesu*, p. 195.

wetted the cheeks of the greatest of the Old Testament saints, and which still, in our day, flow from the eyes of the most devout of Christians? Do we ever see Jesus smite upon his breast like the publican, saying, "God be merciful to me a sinner"? I hear St. Paul exclaiming in the bitterness of his soul, "The good that I would I do not, but the evil which I would not, that I do: who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" Can your ear detect a syllable of the kind from the lips of Jesus.

Socrates, the wisest and best of men outside the people of Israel, seeing his disciples ridiculing a physiognomist who said he could trace in his features indications of every vice, declared that he had within him the germ of all these evil tendencies.[1] Was ever any such confession made by Jesus Christ?

No, the sigh of a contrite heart is altogether foreign to the life of Jesus. Could it then be that He was ignorant of what his disciple St. Paul knew so well, that evil exists, in man especially, in the desires, in the secret springs of the heart, and that He allowed Himself to be caught in the same snare as the Pharisees—that of being satisfied with a mere external righteousness? So far from it, that it was He who pronounced those immortal words which brand a single impure look as incipient adultery; the emotion of anger, or of mockery of another, as incipient murder; an oath added needlessly to the simple yea or nay, as incipient perjury. Again, is it not He who teaches us to see in acts of ostentation or of self-conceit something hateful in the sight of God, and in a lie an act of submission to a Satanic im-

[1] Cicero, *De fato*, c.

pulse? Or, will some one perhaps say that it was because He understood so completely the goodness of God, that He did not impute to Himself imperfections which He well knew were at once forgiven? But in that case why did He so severely reprehend in others that which He condemned so slightly in Himself?

You see the mind of Jesus with regard to sin. He who unveiled to mankind its existence under the most spiritual and subtle forms, and who thus once for all overthrew the throne of Pharisaism upon earth, never dreams of charging Himself with it. He speaks of sin—He does so continually—but never as attaching to Himself. "If ye, being evil," He says; not, "If we, being evil." Or again, "Ye must be born again;" but not, "We must be born again." Once more: "When ye pray, say, Our Father which art in heaven, . . . forgive us our trespasses;" but never, "My Father, forgive me," nor any similar exclamation. Nay, more—He addressed once to the Jews this challenge: "Which of you convicteth me of sin?" No doubt the silence of his auditors when thus questioned proves nothing: they might be ignorant of the secret faults, the inward sins, of Him who thus challenged them. But the question of Jesus itself proves much—proves all. For how, with a sensitive conscience such as his, if He felt Himself burdened with the slightest sin, could He, without hypocrisy, put to others a question which between Himself and God He must answer in a way different from theirs, and then claim a victory by their silence?

It is with this same feeling of perfect innocence that, addressing Himself to the women of Jerusalem

on his way to the cross, He utters this piercing sentence, "If they do these things in a green tree, what shall be done in the dry?" which can only mean, "If God's judgments fall so heavily upon the righteous, with what a weight will they not one day descend upon sinners!"

Not only does He feel Himself free from any act chargeable with sin, from any sinful or even idle word, from every guilty feeling, from every desire which can stain the soul, from every wish contrary to the Divine will; but He is certain that He has never neglected any good action which He was called to do, never been guilty of the smallest omission in fulfilling the work entrusted to Him by his Father. "I have glorified thee on the earth," He says,at a time when other mortal men breathe to Heaven a sigh over a life which they feel has contained so many moments, if not ill-spent, yet at least wasted; "I have finished the work thou gavest me to do." In these supreme moments He found his consolation in this: "The Father hath not left me alone, for I do always those things that please Him."[1]

On his way to Gethsemane, to meet the invisible enemy whose approach He already feels within Him, "The prince of this world cometh," He says, "but hath nothing in me." Such is the verdict of the conscience of Jesus with reference to Himself. That conscience of Jesus is indeed, as M. Keim says, "the only conscience without a scar" in the whole history of mankind.

In presence of this unexampled moral fact, there are but two alternatives: either Jesus was indeed

[1] John xvii. 4; viii. 29.

perfectly holy, as his conscience bears witness; or He was the blindest and most hardened of men, since his conscience did not reveal to Him the most elementary fact of morality, the fact with which every child is acquainted by his inward experience before his attention is drawn to it by others—the presence of sin. Between these two alternatives, I suppose we shall not find it difficult to decide.

Do not even free-thinkers acknowledge Jesus to have been one of the most moral men the world has ever produced? They therefore absolutely exclude the latter alternative, and, according to the laws of logic, to which free thought, notwithstanding all its freedom, is still compelled to submit, they have no choice but to concede the former and to say with us, We have here a moral miracle; Jesus was absolutely holy.

The result obtained from these testimonies of the conscience of Christ is completely in harmony with the nature of the mission which He attributes to Himself towards mankind. He calls Himself the *Physician* of mankind, sent to those that are sick: could He be that, were He sick Himself? He calls to Himself those who *travail and are heavy laden*, promising to give them comfort: could He do so had he not felt Himself to be free from the burden which oppressed them? He came to seek and to save that *which was lost:* how could He accomplish this mission if He were Himself lost? unless we say that no one is really lost, which would annul, on the other hand, the testimony of the conscience of Christ respecting the moral condition of mankind.

He is not only the Physician of diseased humanity,

He is the Victim whose blood is to make atonement for it. "He is come," He says, "to give his life a ransom for many." [1] Could this be, if He needed redemption Himself? Shortly before his death He uttered these sacramental words, "This is my blood which is shed for the remission of sins." The law allowed none but victims without blemish and without spot. Could Jesus have thought He could offer Himself upon the altar of expiation, had He recognized in Himself the slightest stain of sin? To attribute to Himself the office of a sacrifice for the sins of the world, without having in Him the consciousness of perfect holiness, would have been the height of folly.

The height, do I say? But there would have been on earth a degree of insanity more marvellous still. Jesus declares, in several of his discourses, that He is to return to judge the world, and to summon before his bar all mankind. "Watch ye, therefore," He says, "and pray always, that ye may be able to stand *before the Son of man.*" [2]

He attributes to Himself this character of Judge of the world even in that Sermon on the Mount, to which free-thinkers would reduce the whole of his teaching. There we read, "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven. . . . Many will say to me in that day, . . . Have we not done many wonderful works in thy name? . . . Then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me ye that work iniquity." [3]

And must not He who thus places Himself before

[1] Matt. xx. 28. [2] Luke xxi. 36. [3] Matt. vii. 21–23.

the world as the representative of the holiness of God, and the organ of perfect justice in the solemn act of the universal judgment, have felt Himself to be clear of all sin? What! would the sentence not die out upon the lips of the judge who felt himself a transgressor? Taking his place among the multitude, from whom He was distinguished by but a shade of difference, must He not have said to them, "Let us kneel together and pray for mercy"? Once more we repeat, Logic has its rights, to which free thought must submit itself. Either Jesus was insane, or else He was perfectly holy![1] Let us conclude this part of our subject with the words of Keim, the author of the latest work, and the most learned, on the life of Jesus. "Any one who gives himself up to the discourses and acts of the Lord, comes forth from that contemplation with this irresistible impression: Here we behold a conscience which never underwent the stings of the sense of sin. And this is not because we have here a moralist satisfied with a low and easy standard. Oh, no! He even charged with guilt a mere look, an idle word, and—hidden behind the screen of outward acts—the impure heart. He rebuked energetically the age in which He lived; He made his disciples ashamed of

[1] We are not ignorant of the attempts which have been made to eliminate by processes and hypotheses of criticism those words in which Jesus declares Himself judge of all. But after these excisions have been made, we shall have further to eliminate the words in which He declares Himself to be the Sacrifice, the Physician, the Saviour; and, after that, those in which He testifies to his own moral purity. And after all this, what would there be left to account for the faith of the apostles and the foundation of the Church, not to speak of the complete arbitrariness which characterizes these excisions of criticism? Men first sketch a Jesus such as they would have Him to be, then they cut and hack at the documents, as at a piece of cloth, till they shape out the teaching of Jesus after their pattern. Then they tell us, This is the history. But is it not a mere conjuring trick?

their weaknesses; He made them pray for the forgiveness of their sins. But He Himself, the man of the most absorbing of vocations, charged with the vastest mission, called day by day to submit his lofty spirit to the duties imposed upon Him by the life of humility and of self-renunciation, of gentle sympathy and silent submissiveness, which He had voluntarily undertaken, asks for no forgiveness for Himself, not even at Gethsemane or Golgotha; He ever walks in the bright sunshine of the fatherly love of God; He draws others into the belief of his perfect goodness; He forgives sinners in the name of God; He dies for them, and prepares to take his seat on the judgment-throne of the all-holy God." [1]

F. GODET.

ST. JOHN'S VIEW OF JESUS ON THE CROSS.

ST. JOHN xix. 28–37.

IT may be taken for granted in the following pages that, in the view of St. John, Jesus on the cross is the true Paschal Lamb. To say nothing of other passages of his Gospel, the quotation by the Evangelist in Chapter xix. 36, 37 of the two Old Testament texts there given is sufficient to establish this, and further argument may be dispensed with.

The point now immediately before us is a different one, and the question which we propose to answer may be stated in the following terms. Does St. John, seeing in Jesus on the cross the Paschal Lamb, see it at the moment when it was slain for the feast of the following night, or at that when it was placed upon

[1] *Der Geschichtliche Christus*, p. 109 *et seq.*

the table, to supply the food of the paschal supper? The first of these views is that generally entertained. If the latter has been taken at all, it has not at least been brought distinctly before the Church. It is the view, however, which we shall endeavour to establish in the present essay; and it seems to us that, if it can be established, it will be found to be of no small importance for the light thrown by it, both upon the theology of St. John and upon the relation of his narrative of the events of the last hours of Jesus to the narratives of the same events by the earlier Evangelists.

In entering upon this inquiry there are three characteristics of the beloved disciple upon which we must proceed. It is hardly possible, indeed, to do more than mention them. To give either the proof or the illustrations that might be easily supplied, would occupy much more space than we can command.

The first is what may be called the Evangelist's love of symbolism — his tendency, a tendency in which he only followed closely in the steps of his Master, to see in everything that happened around him, down even to its minute particulars, a symbol of deeper truths. How much this tendency penetrates the structure of the Fourth Gospel has not yet been shewn with the distinctness and fulness of treatment which it deserves. But it will be admitted by many, perhaps even by most, to such an extent as will justify our here assuming that it exists. Those who do not allow its existence will find nothing satisfactory to them in what we are about to say.

The second characteristic, proof of which must

also be dispensed with, is closely connected with the first. It is the tendency of the Evangelist to *select*, from the numerous particulars making up any event that occurs, those which best adapt themselves to this symbolical treatment, while at the same time they convey with sufficient accuracy the idea of the scene. Not that the narrative is either invented for the purpose of expressing an idea, or gives an unhistorical representation of the facts. That it is not the former is proved by the character of the Gospel as a whole; for, pervaded as it is by the idealism of the writer, it affords every token which can be desired that the idealism rests upon a historical foundation. That it is not the latter is proved alike by the general tone of the author and by the harmonious verisimilitude of the picture that he presents. It must be borne in mind that no historian can exhaust all the details of any important event related by him, or present it in all the points of view in which it is possible to regard it. Consciously or unconsciously, *he must select*. Frequently he does not see, not less frequently he does not care to see, all that is seen by others. And if, especially, he wishes to set forth any incident recorded by him as an illustration of some principle of the Divine government, or of some particular aspect of the actors in it, he will mainly dwell, by the very necessity of the case, upon what has the most direct connection with his aim. His narrative, as one of facts, will thus be in a certain sense imperfect. It will share the general imperfection of all narratives, in so far as it will fail to relate everything that took place. It will have an additional imperfection of its own, in so far as it may deliberately

omit what the writer regarded as of no importance to his special design. But it will not on either of these accounts be unhistorical. Nay, it may be much more truly historical than one in which details are given with greater fulness. It may have caught the spirit of the scene, and its author may enable us to penetrate more thoroughly into the heart of the history than if he had occupied himself with a multitude of details, amidst which the singleness and force of their real bearing would have been lost.

A third characteristic of St. John's tone of mind, of which we shall avail ourselves in the following discussion, is his habit of viewing things in doubles, in such a way that all good has over against it counterpart evil, evil presenting to it a mocking resemblance. It would take a whole paper to illustrate this as it deserves to be illustrated, for it is a principle not unfrequently having a very close bearing upon the interpretation of St. John's writings, both in larger paragraphs and in individual expressions. Let us only observe that it does not apply merely to such contrasts as those of light and darkness, of life and death, but also to scenes in which the enemies of God play their part, unconsciously copying for evil and for self-destruction what would have been in similar circumstances the conduct of the friends of God for good and for spiritual blessing. It may be enough to refer, in illustration of this, to the scene with Caiaphas in Chapter xi., where that crafty and hard man unconsciously plays the part of a true prophet of God in what he says alike of the death of Jesus and of his work; where also we cannot fail to mark a kind of irony of Divine providence in the

mode in which the Jewish Council expresses its fear of the consequences of "letting Jesus alone." Its words had their disastrous fulfilment through the very means which they employed to escape their fate: "If we let him alone all men will believe on him, and the Romans will come and take away both our place and nation." The facts, as they afterwards turned out before the eye of the Evangelist, were to him not merely judgment, but irony of judgment; judgment, in its form, the mocking counterpart of blessing that might have been.

Keeping these principles in view, let us proceed to the consideration of the point before us. The passage to be examined, with the omission of certain clauses not material to the argument, is John xix. 28–37; and it may be stated once for all that we accept the narrative as one of facts. Nothing in it is due to the imagination of the writer. He selects his facts, groups them after his own fashion, places them in the light that appears to him to be suitable to his purpose, but he does not create them. Is then Jesus in this passage the Paschal Lamb at the moment of its death? or is He the Lamb at a later point when, after death, it has been prepared for the paschal table, and has been placed upon it for distribution to the guests?

The answer to this question is to be found in a consideration of the details of the narrative, not merely in themselves, but in the light of the principle of symbolism already spoken of. To that principle we are entitled to appeal. That it is often made use of in the Fourth Gospel it is impossible to deny. That it is made use of here is proved by the simple

fact that Jesus is here presented to us as the Paschal Lamb. If there be symbolism in the general picture, there is at least a probability that it exists also in the details. This probability is strengthened when we observe that we are expressly taught by the Evangelist that some of his details, such as the leaving of the legs of Jesus unbroken and the piercing of his side with the soldier's spear, had their corresponding facts in the history of the paschal lamb, and so helped to fill out symbolically the ideas connected with what he saw before him. It is thus natural to think that the same feature will be found in other details, although in regard to them no similar statement is made. Still further, if there be anything in the language in which the details are mentioned of so peculiar a kind as to convey the impression that they must have been designed to bear another than their purely historical meaning, we are not only justified in trying to discover their special application and force, but we are distinctly called upon to do so. Finally, if it shall appear that, by looking at them in a symbolical light, the difficulties of the narrative are removed, and it becomes possible not only to explain each detail separately, but to group them into one harmonious whole, the principle of interpretation applied will receive all the confirmation that can be desired. What we have to do, therefore, is first to consider the details of our narrative with a view to discover whether they are introduced in such a way as to lead to the impression that they are selected and treated for the sake of a deeper than their simple historical sense. Next, we have to see whether there is anything in what was done with the paschal lamb

offering an unmistakable correspondence with them. Lastly, we have to note the particular stage in the history of the lamb which offers the correspondence. That stage will be the one in which Jesus is brought before us as the fulfilment of all that the paschal lamb of Israel typified and shadowed forth.

I.

We take, first, one or two separate details contained in *Verse* 29. That verse runs as follows: "There was set a vessel full of vinegar: they put a sponge therefore full of the vinegar upon hyssop, and put it to his mouth." Three details meet us here: the "vessel full of vinegar," the "hyssop," and the phrase "put it to his mouth."

The "vessel full of vinegar." It is of no moment to inquire whether the "vinegar" thus mentioned is to be thought of as pure or as mixed with water. Even if the latter, it is the vinegar element in the mixture that arrests the attention of the Evangelist. We pass at once to the manner in which the fact is recorded, as compared with the manner in which the same fact is described in the first two Gospels. At first sight it certainly appears as if the differences were trifling. If they stood alone there might be nothing in them to attract attention. But it may be otherwise if there are later and clearer parts of the passage from which they derive a reflected light; and we must, therefore, ask our readers not to come to too hasty a conclusion, but to suspend their judgment upon what we have to say until the whole passage has been considered. Yet, for the sake of keeping the order of the text, we note the

differences now. St. Matthew's words (Chap. xxvii. 48), with which those of St. Mark (Chap. xv. 36) closely correspond, are, "And straightway one of them ran and took a sponge and filled it with vinegar." It will be observed that St. Matthew and St. Mark speak only of "one" person who did this; St. John uses the plural "they." Again, the former tell us only that the sponge was filled with vinegar; the latter informs us that the vinegar was drawn from "a vessel full" of it; and, when we remember the interest attached by him to the water-pots "filled up to the brim" of Chapter ii. 7, and to the net "full of great fishes" of Chapter xxi. 11, it seems not unlikely that this *fulness* of the vinegar vessel is not to his mind without a special meaning. Again, there may be something in the use of ἔκειτο, "there was set," a verb which in its employment by St. John, as in Jeremiah xxiv. 1, and in the prophetical passage, Luke ii. 34, seems to indicate not merely "being set" or "standing," but having a plan or character assigned by Divine arrangement (John ii. 6; xx. 5, 6, 7; Rev. iv. 2; xxi. 16). Finally, St. John is the only Evangelist who sees in the offering of the vinegar the fulfilment of Psalm lxix. 21, a psalm in a high degree applicable to the sufferings of the Messiah. These particulars are small, but taken together they are not without weight; and when we consider, notwithstanding the opinion of some commentators to the contrary, that the incident embodied in them is described as an aggravation, not as an alleviation, of the sufferings of Jesus, and that they all tend to bring out these sufferings with a liveliness greater than that of the earlier Gospels,

we can hardly be wrong in thinking that they receive the peculiar form in which they are expressed for the very purpose of accomplishing this end.

It is not, enough, however, to say that the circumstances now mentioned constitute simply a more vivid representation of the sufferings of Jesus than is set before us in the earlier Gospels. When we examine the passage more minutely, we seem to see a distinct intimation on the part of St. John that the scene of unbelief and hatred which he describes is regarded by him as the opposite and counterpart of that true paschal feast in which faith and love would have partaken of the true Paschal Lamb. One or two preliminary considerations may help to establish this. In the first place, there can be no doubt that vinegar was used in the paschal ritual. It was an ingredient of the sauce in which the bitter herbs were dipped.[1] In the second place, the words of Psalm lxix. 21, referred to in this passage, connect vinegar, not only with the sufferings and trials of the believer's pilgrimage on earth, but directly and immediately with those of Jesus Himself, the true Paschal Lamb, "In my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink." In the third place, the "I thirst" of Jesus, spoken in *Verse* 28, cannot well be confined to mere bodily thirst. That such thirst is included, or rather that it forms the groundwork of the figure, we do not deny; and, were the present the only passage in which the thought occurs, it might be necessary to think of nothing more. But the clearly symbolical treatment of the thirst of Jesus, in his interview with the woman of Samaria in Chapter iv., leads to the conclusion that

[1] Surenhusius, Mishna, Pesachim x. 3.

his present "I thirst" proceeded from a thirst of soul as well as of body; that it was his longing cry, in the last moment of life, to behold the great harvest reaped which He had sown amidst so many tears.

Keeping these three points in view, light dawns upon the idea of the Evangelist when he marks the offering of vinegar by the guilty Jews.[1] At a true paschal supper, in which the eye of faith beheld the antitype in the type, a believing Jew, as he tasted the vinegar, would have entered into sympathy with the sufferings of Jesus, would have felt that he had a share in them, would have joyfully appropriated them as his own. He would have welcomed the bitter vinegar as that which told him of a suffering Redeemer, and of his own fellowship with his sufferings. He would have beheld the true Paschal Lamb before him, suffering for his sake, thirsting for his salvation, telling him of a greater deliverance than that of his fathers from the bondage of Egypt. That is what

[1] It seems to be generally taken for granted that the fluid here spoken of as "vinegar" was the sour wine used by the Roman soldiers, an impression probably the more readily rested in because Roman soldiers are thought to be the persons who presented it to the lips of Jesus. But the parallel passages in the other Gospels, particularly Matthew xxvii. 47, make it clear that it is the Jews who do so, and John xix. 32, introducing the soldiers *afresh* upon the scene, confirms this conclusion. It is thus improbable that, in a purely Jewish scene, with only Jewish actors in it, we should meet with the drink of the Roman soldiery. It is much more probable that, at this paschal season, when vinegar was so much used by the Jews, they should have had some of it beside them. Godet, though we do not fully understand his words, may be quoted as decisively of opinion that the ὄξος spoken of was not the soldiers' wine. "The drink now offered Jesus," he says, "is simply one of vinegar prepared for the condemned criminals, as is proved by the sponge and the rod of hyssop. This last circumstance overthrows the opinion of those who think that it was wine intended for the soldiers" (*in loc.*). The symbolism, indeed, is not necessarily destroyed by the supposition that the vinegar was this wine, but it certainly receives force from the, in itself, much more probable supposition adopted in the text, that the vinegar was simply vinegar, and that the requirements of the paschal season explain its being at hand.

faith would have done. What do these Jews do? Exactly the opposite. Instead of glorying in the sufferings of Jesus, they take offence at them. Instead of seeing in Jesus a true Paschal Lamb, the vinegar of whose sufferings is to be made their own, they use the vinegar of that "vessel full" of it to increase his sorrow. Instead of partaking of the vinegar themselves, they cruelly thrust it to the lips of Jesus, as if it could quench the longings of his soul. In short, as they have steeled their hearts against Him, and are determined, to the utmost of their power, to aggravate his woe, an overruling providence leads them to do this in a way which makes their mockery a kind of *inverted and contorted passover*. They will have a feast, they will "rejoice and make merry" over Jesus on the cross (comp. Rev. xi. 7–10); and, in the bitter but deserved irony of God, a feast that would have been rich in blessing to the spirit of faith, becomes, to their spirit of unbelief, the instrument of deepening their sin, their degradation, and their shame.

(2) The second detail requiring examination is the "hyssop." In the earlier Evangelists we are informed that the sponge filled with vinegar was put upon "a reed;" and we are met by the well-known difficulty of reconciling that statement with the statement of St. John. That the account of the latter is not given without a purpose, will be acknowledged by every student of his writings. But what is the purpose? With the object that we have in view, we may spare our readers any laborious investigation into the nature of the plant called hyssop, although the result of such investigation would be that the "hyssop" of Scrip-

ture is of small and low growth, affording no branch that can be described as "a reed." [1] Whether, how-

[1] Few questions with regard to the plants of the Bible have perplexed inquirers more than that relating to the identification of "hyssop." The learned Celsius, whose essay regarding it, in his *Hierobotanicon*, is distinguished by even a greater than ordinary degree of his elaborateness and care, says that to give a correct opinion regarding it *res est longe difficillima*, while he examines no fewer than eighteen plants in order to determine whether their characteristics correspond to those ascribed to hyssop in Scripture. The difficulties of the question, too, are strikingly illustrated by the efforts of several distinguished scholars to amend the reading as the only satisfactory means of escaping them. Thus, Camerarius thought that for ὑσσώπῳ should be read ὑσσῳ, a kind of spear, for which Heinsius would substitute ὕσυπον, unwashed and greasy wool. Even Bochart, whose investigation is hardly less painstaking than that of Celsius, can only suggest that ὕσσωπον should be read (*Hierozoicon*, lib. ii. c. 50). These solutions must of course be dismissed, and the well-established reading of the text retained.

Without endeavouring to determine exactly what plant now known is that referred to by the Evangelist, it will be observed that the main point of interest in the inquiry is, whether it was one capable of yielding a cane or strong stem of at least a foot and a half long, or whether it was a small, low-growing plant, from which only a bunch of tiny twigs and leaves could be obtained. This point ought not to be so difficult of determination as the exact *genus* and *species* of the plant.

1. There can be no reasonable doubt that the ὕσσωπος of the New Testament is the אֵזוֹב of the Old. Apart from all other considerations, the similarity of the names may be accepted as conclusive upon this point.

2. The hyssop of the Old Testament was mainly used for sprinkling, and, although detergent and bitter qualities of the plant may have led in part to its employment for this purpose, there can be no doubt that its selection must also have been determined by its mode of growth, by its possession of a bushy habit, which would fit it for being gathered together in a bunch, and so for retaining a sufficient amount of the fluid to be sprinkled. This consideration leads to the thought of a thick and low plant rather than to that of one with strong stems of considerable length.

3. The passage in 1 Kings iv. 33 is of considerable bearing on the subject. We are there told of Solomon that "he spake of trees, from the cedar tree that is in Lebanon, even unto the hyssop that springeth out of the wall;" and the conclusion has been drawn that hyssop must have had the form and habit of a "tree." Even granting the conclusion, no plant yet suggested for the hyssop possesses such a character. A plant only able to yield stems a foot and a half long is no more a "tree" than one of much humbler growth. Besides this, the true inference from the words quoted lies all the other way. To the Jew, the cedar in Lebanon was the noblest tree of the forest. When desirous to convey a graphic idea of the extent of the knowledge of his great king, he would naturally pass from it to the other extremity of the vegetable world, and the smallness of a plant would form a main ground of its being selected to express this. It appears, too, from Joshua ii. 6, that the Hebrew term,

ever, it can afford such a branch or not, will not help us much. It may have been capable of yielding a reed at once firm and long enough to enable the holder to reach with it the mouth of Jesus on the cross. Yet, even then, we should have to ask, Why it is not called, as by the other Evangelists, "a reed"? It may have been incapable of yielding a strong reed. The question remains, Why is it mentioned at all? attended by the additional difficulty of explaining how, by means of it, the sponge was lifted to the necessary

like the Greek one in Matthew xiii. 31, was of much wider signification than our word "tree."

4. It is particularly to be noticed, that if not such a plant as we suppose, the only other tenable supposition is that it is one of the Caper family, most probably the *Capparis Spinosa*. This is the opinion of Dr. Forbes Royle, in a paper, which we have not seen, in the "Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society," viii. pp. 193–212; and it has been adopted by Stanley ("Sinai and Pal." p. 22), apparently Thomson ("Land and Book," p. 112), and the most recent travellers. Yet the description given of the *Capparis*, both by these writers and by botanists, is fatal to this idea. The branches may be long enough, but they are too weak to suit the necessities of our text. There is no evidence that they can supply what may be called a "reed;" and, unless they can do so, *the whole purpose of the supposition, that of reconciling St. John's ὑσσώπῳ with the καλάμῳ of the first two Evangelists, is defeated.* The plant is "a trailing shrub with numerous slender stems" (Carruthers, in "Bible Educator," i. 225); it has "a sprawling creeping habit" (Hamilton, in "Imp. Dict. of the Bible," i. 771); it has "long slender stems" (Thomson). Such descriptions are inconsistent with the nature of the stem that St. John must have had in his eye. No such stem could have supported the weight of the sponge filled with vinegar.

In addition to all this it may be remarked, that if the "hyssop" be the trailing plant supposed, there is something extremely strange in the fact that the Evangelist should use only the word *ὑσσώπῳ*. We might certainly have expected that he would insert some word that might express a *cane*, a *stem*, or *reed*, of hyssop; while, on the other hand, if the plant be so low and bushy as we imagine, the word used by him is in its natural place and is used in its proper sense. Any other supposition, too, makes it necessary to think that the cross was lower than it is at least generally imagined to have been.

Upon the whole, it seems to us impossible to identify the "hyssop" of Scripture with any species of the *Capparis;* and that it was rather the *Origanum*, the traditional hyssop of the Jews (comp. the excellent article by Mr. Carruthers in "Bible Educator," i. 225, and that under "Hyssop" in "Imp. Dict. of the Bible").

height. A probable explanation of this latter point appears to be that the instrument employed consisted of two parts. The stem was the "reed," a bushy plant fixed on the end of it was the "hyssop;" and we have before us the very simple phenomenon, that different writers, describing the use made of an instrument of two parts, mention, the one the one, the other the other part. St. Matthew and St. Mark fix upon the stem as if it were the whole, and say that the sponge was wrapped about the "reed." St. John fixes upon the extremity, consisting of a bunch of hyssop, and tells us that the sponge with its vinegar was wrapped about the "hyssop." This explanation, if adopted, will afford an interesting illustration of the manner in which the Fourth Evangelist *selects* from a combination of particulars that which is in correspondence with his aim.[1]

What is this aim and what is the meaning of the incident? One or two different considerations will supply the answer. In the first place, hyssop, like vinegar, was used in the paschal ritual. It had been originally employed by the express command of the Almighty for sprinkling the blood of the paschal lamb upon the lintels and side posts of the houses of the Israelites in Egypt, that, thus separated from those of the Egyptians, the destroying angel might pass them by (Exod. xii. 22). It may have been

[1] Celsius (*Hierob.* p. 434) says, speaking of Leviticus xiv. 4, and Numbers xix. 18, that the sprinkler referred to was composed of a bunch of hyssop tied to a rod or cane of cedar wood, by means of a scarlet thread. Buxtorf (Lexion Ch. p. 50) also says, *Præceptum hyssopi erat (id est, fasciculi hyssopi), ut constaret tribus caulibus, in quibus essent tres culmi sive ramusculi.* Para, ch. ii. *Hyssopus brevior ligabatur filo ad bacillum.* Para, ch. ii. Celsius (p. 446) also quotes the Aethiopic version as reading, *Et erat ibi vas aceto plenum, et impleverunt spongiam aceto ac foliis hyssopi, et ligarunt super arundinem.*

selected for this purpose, partly owing to the bushy character which fitted it for sprinkling, partly owing to the bitter and detergent qualities which made it an appropriate symbol of cleansing. Such a use of it indeed belonged only to the passover of Egypt, and had been discontinued long before the days of Christ. But hyssop had still a place in the ritual, and Maimonides speaks of it as one of those things which entered into the composition of the sauce placed upon the table along with the roasted body of the paschal lamb.[1] At all events, there can be no doubt that with the thought of the Jewish Passover the thought of hyssop was most intimately associated. In the second place, in the ritual of the law as a whole, hyssop was the symbol of cleansing. It was employed in the cleansing of the leper (Lev. xiv. 4); in the sprinkling of the water of purification containing the ashes of the red heifer (Numb. xix. 18); and, according to the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (Chap. ix. 19), it had been used by Moses when, at the solemn institution of the covenant in Exodus xxiv., he "sprinkled both the book and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the covenant which God hath enjoined unto you." Hence also the language of David, "Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean" (Psa. li. 7). In the third place, to be made clean is in the Gospel of St. John, according to the view at least of its writer, the central idea of the work effected by the Redeemer for men. We see this in the account of the miracle at Cana of Galilee, when, beholding in that miracle the glory of the New

[1] M. Surenhusius, Pesachim x. 3.

Testament Dispensation, he brings the wine of the Gospel into such pointed contrast with the "waterpots set there after the manner of *the purifying* of the Jews" (Chap. ii. 6). We see it in the record of that contest between the disciples of the Baptist and the Jew which leads to the last triumphant expression of the Baptist's faith (Chap. iii. 27, &c.), for that contest, he is careful to tell us, had arisen "about purifying" (Chap. iii. 25); we see it when he quotes Jesus as saying to the disciples, that He might describe their perfect standing in Him, "Ye are clean" (Chap. xiii. 10); we seem to see it also in one of the parts of his description of the New Jerusalem, when he tells us that "the city was pure (clean) gold, like unto clear (clean) glass" (Rev. xxi. 18). These passages are sufficient to shew how close was the connection in the mind of St. John between cleansing and the highest blessings of the Gospel.

Now, therefore, as before, with these points in mind, we can understand why our Evangelist attaches such special importance to the "hyssop." Again he sees in the wrapping around it of the sponge filled with vinegar the mocking counterpart of what the pious Israelite would have done with hyssop at a true paschal feast. Beholding in it the emblem of a precious though a bitter cleansing, such an Israelite would have eaten it with devout thankfulness and joy.[1] More especially, lifting his heart to Jesus as the true Paschal Lamb, he would have

[1] Bähr tells us that hyssop was regarded throughout the whole ancient world as the means of purification; that with this view it was mixed with food and used by physicians as a medicine; that in Egypt it was eaten by the priests with bread, and that this use of it passed over to the Therapeutæ (Symbolik, ii. 503).

been made partaker of a sprinkling of his blood, of a separation from a sinful world, by which he would have been assured of an eternal deliverance from all his spiritual enemies. But it was not so with the guilty Jews around the cross. Instead of this, they used the hyssop to increase the sufferings of Jesus, and the better to express their mockery. What *a travesty* of a believing Passover! The very plant which, partaken of in faith, would have been to them the symbol of their interest in the redeeming work of Jesus, becomes, again in the bitter irony of God, yet they know it not, the means of illustrating that abyss of hardened unbelief into which they have deliberately plunged themselves.

(3) A third detail in the verse we are now examining remains. It is the expression, "Put it to his mouth." The expression, remarkable enough in itself, would appear still more so, if we might translate not "put" but "offered it to his mouth." It is the same verb used in Chapter xvi. 2, where the rendering of the Authorized Version completely misses the point of the original. Not "doeth God service" is the meaning there, but "offereth service," that is, religious service, "to God." So great, would Jesus say, will be the fanaticism of your enemies that they will kill you in the belief that they are thereby rendering acceptable sacrifice to the Almighty. In like manner here, the true translation of the word, which is a sacrificial one, is not "put" but "offered," and the whole principle of our present exposition gains fresh confirmation from the fact. We shall not, however, urge this. We call attention rather to what will hardly be denied, that St. John, in departing

from the simple and natural language, "gave him to drink," must have had a reason for doing so. What is that reason? In the first place, it is almost unnecessary to say that the paschal ritual was one in which the mouth was chiefly used. The lamb was to be eaten, and so also were the vinegar and the hyssop. In the second place, just as the vinegar and the hyssop expressed something common to both the believer and his Lord, so also there is that connected with the mouth which does the same. Let us look at the words of Jesus Himself in Chapter xv. 3, "Now ye are clean on account of (not 'through,' as in the Authorized Version) the word that I have spoken unto you;" that is, He was the Word of life Himself, He was about to commit his word to the disciples, to "give them" the word which the Father had given Him (comp. Chap. xvii. 14); and, that they might rightly use that word, and be to the world in a certain sense a Word as He had been, He had cleansed them as He had done. (Comp. Isa. vi. 7.)

Once more, then, we can understand why our Evangelist employs so remarkable an expression as that before us. In the conduct of the Jews he sees the mocking counterpart of what a genuine Israelite would have done at a true paschal feast. Such an Israelite would have devoutly partaken of the Lamb of God, together with the other accompaniments of the supper. In doing so he would have "tasted of the Word of Life;" and that life would have become a life in him which would have impelled him to declare it to others (1 John i. 3). Not so with those who had been the chief instruments in nailing Jesus.

to the cross. Instead of this, they impiously thrust the elements of their meal into his mouth—into that mouth out of which had come those words that ought to have been life to them, and that were life to faith. Do we not see, once more, the *inverted and contorted passover?* And, once more, can we fail to mark the keen but deserved irony of God which leads Jewish guilt and folly to express itself as it does? The Jews seize the first and readiest way of mocking the Redeemer; and, all unconsciously, they do it by means of an action, the counterpart of that which, gone about in a spirit of faith, would have exhibited their noblest privilege, and enriched them with the choicest blessings.[1]

Such are the three points of detail in *Verse* 29. Their bearing upon the question in which we are immediately interested is so obvious, that little need be said to bring it out. All three take us to a moment in the history of the paschal lamb *later* than that of its death. They are connected with the eating rather than the killing of the lamb, with the celebration of the paschal feast rather than with preparation for it. Even should the particular light in which we have endeavoured to shew that St. John looks at the incidents described by him be thought to be insufficiently established, this conclusion ought not

[1] It seemed to the writer for a time that this singular expression might perhaps be traceable to some custom of putting leaves of the hyssop-plant *into the mouth of the lamb when it was placed on the table.* Such a practice might easily be supposed to have existed as a substitute for, and a memorial of, the first use of hyssop in connection with the passover of Egypt. And, if it did exist, it might explain the custom, still invariably followed, that when a young animal, such as a pig, is roasted whole, it is brought to the table with fruit or vegetables *in its mouth.* He has, however, been unable to discover any traces of such a custom in the case of the paschal lamb, and he mentions the conjecture now simply with the view of directing the attention of others to the point.

to be affected. The mouth is certainly connected with eating. Vinegar and hyssop, in the time of Christ, had no place in the ritual with the lamb at the time of death, and, as eaten, could have relation only to the paschal supper. When, therefore, we remember that we have the Paschal Lamb before us in Jesus as He hangs upon the cross, it seems impossible to doubt that we are invited to behold Him as that lamb, not in the instant of its death, but as placed upon the table for the paschal meal.

WILLIAM MILLIGAN.

III.

THE REIGN OF LAW AN INCENTIVE TO PRAYER.

We have seen that "the reign of law" by no means renders prayer unreasonable; that, in many ways, and without any violation of law, God may answer our petitions. We must now attempt a bolder flight, and try to shew that this very reign of law, so far from being, as we are told, a conclusive reason *against* prayer, is, in fact, a sufficient reason *for* it, a common and keen incentive to the habit of hopeful supplication.

No man who is at once thoughtful and devout can regret to see religious questions even of the gravest kind discussed by public men, in our public prints, provided always that the discussion is marked by sincerity and reverence, however much he may differ from the conclusions at which they arrive. Such discussions breed doubts, indeed; but these very doubts both deepen and confirm our faith in the end,

if at least we handle them wisely, and help us to correct what is erroneous and to enlarge what is narrow in our conceptions of religious truth, or in our modes of stating them.

This very discussion on the reasonableness and efficacy of prayer, for example, which has now been carried on for some years, and seems, for a while at least, to have drawn to a close, has been already of the greatest service to the Church. It has done much to banish from the popular mind the notion that, by due importunity, we may weary or constrain God into granting us whatever, or almost whatever, we ask of Him. True, this notion was always opposed to all that thoughtful men have acknowledged to be the true function of prayer, and even to what the unthoughtful have always *professed* to believe about it. For surely no man, who had in any measure possessed himself of the spirit of Christ, has ever failed to add to his most importunate petitions the saving clause, "if it be the will of God." At the same time it must be confessed that thousands of good men and women used to think it possible that almost anything might come to be the will of God, if only they asked for it often enough and urgently enough. *This* notion has, I say, been well nigh banished from the mind of the Church by the recent discussion. More and more, we are all coming to feel that the very best thing we can desire is that God's will for us should be done rather than our own, and that a chief function of prayer is to lift these weak erring wills of ours into a free and happy consent with his wise and holy Will. In short, that clause, "if it be thy will," is becoming an essential

and pervading element of our prayers, and no longer, as too often it used to be, a mere perfunctory courtesy appended to our prayers, of which we secretly hoped that God would take no notice.

To have our profession thus turned into a reality, to be made *sincere* in our intercourse with Heaven, is a very great gain; and for this gain we are mainly indebted to the sceptics who opened the discussion with a challenge on the efficacy of prayer.

But, surely, this gain would be attended by a loss to match were we to conclude that, because it is a chief function of prayer to draw our wills into harmony with God's will, therefore this is its *only* function: surely our loss would be even greater than our gain were we to conclude that the Divine Will can have no expression save in and through the laws by which the physical phenomena of the universe are shaped, and that therefore the will of God can in no way be affected by our petitions. Yet this is a loss to which we are assured we must submit by one of the philosophies of the day. The alternative it places before us is simply this: Either give up all claim to the exercise of reason, and believe that the universe is ruled by an infinite Caprice, capable of being bent in a thousand different ways by the flatteries and importunities of prayer; or, using discourse of reason, concede that your whole life is ruled by laws which cannot be broken, to the uniform action of which no exceptions can be allowed, and cease to importune God for violations of these laws. But is it, can it, be true that no single point of rest for our reason and heart can be found in the wide interval which separates Law from Caprice? Are *men* never act-

uated by ought but these two motives—a rigorous and uniform observance of law, and a blind submission to irrational caprice? From the tone taken by the fashionable and confident philosophy of the hour one would infer that, in the whole circle of human and Divine motives, there were only these two points! That I may not be suspected of misrepresenting the argument of this school of thought—for the sake of brevity and clearness, and to avoid odious and disparaging nicknames, we may call it the *Uniformitarian* School, since it lays so much stress on the uniform action of the laws under which we live—let me quote a few words from a well-known disciple of it.[1] "*That* doctrine," he says, "is destitute of reasonable foundation" which affirms it to be either possible or desirable "to persuade God to arrest or modify what are called the great natural laws, or to act upon his will so as to alter his intentions in regard either of men or things, souls or bodies." According to him, prayer intended to affect the course of God's actions, either as to our physical or our moral and spiritual life, assumes a caprice at the centre of things which would be quite intolerable to us if we could in any way conceive it in the region of our every-day experience. "No greater misfortune," he maintains, "could befall the human race than that some day it should discover with positive assurance that the successions of phenomena were rendered uncertain by an Unseen Will. Once ascertain that these perturbations by prayer existed to an appreciable extent, and such a discovery would not only unhinge the in-

[1] The citation is from a letter published some two years ago by the Hon. Auberon Herbert, a letter quoted and discussed in "The Spectator."

dustry of the world, would not only make calculation useless and science foolish, but in its moral effect it would bury all activity of thought in the gloom of an abject religion; it would discourage what there is of most manly and generous in the human race; it would change us from a nation of workers into a congregation of monks; and it would involve heaven and earth in a common corruption of flattery on the one side and favour on the other. The degradation of such a system can be felt at once by asking ourselves the question under which *régime* we would elect to live—that of fixed laws, in absolute dependence on which all might regulate their energies and efforts, or a *régime* of asking and receiving, the quantity of the one being regulated by the quantity of the other."

This is a heavy indictment to bring against Prayer and those who believe in it; yet it is only a fair and honest exposition of the view taken by the Uniformitarians. They assume as axioms which need no proof, (1) that the only alternative open to us is that we must live either under the rule of uniform and invariable Laws, or under the rule of a blind and unintelligible Caprice; and (2) that, if we are ruled by Law, and not by Caprice, prayer is utterly irrational and absurd, since the law must take its course, despite our supplications. How are we to meet these assumptions? Let us be bold, and meet them right in the teeth. Let us, not assume, but affirm and try to prove, (1) that the uniform operation of Law, so far from rendering prayer unreasonable and absurd, is the very ground on which we do and ought to pray; and (2) that, as there is much in human motive

and action which is neither a mere observance of Law nor an indulgence of Caprice, so we may well believe, since we are in the image of God, that there is much in Him which cannot be classed under either of these terms.

1. Consider for a moment what is the effect really produced on us by the uniform action of Law in the natural world. We know that the seasons—summer and winter, seed time and harvest—though they may vary within certain limits, will not altogether fail us. Knowing this, we expect them to return upon us in their familiar sequence; we prepare for them, avail ourselves of them, and compel each in turn to minister to our use and welfare. The farmer can sow his seed in winter precisely because he believes that, in the uniform course of Nature, spring will come with its softening rains, summer with its ripening heat, and autumn with its golden sheaves. If there were no uniformity in Nature, if he could not reckon on an unchangeable order and sequence, he would hardly venture to risk his seed-corn in the earth, since he could not be sure that he would receive any return for his expenditure of grain and toil. So that, as indeed Coleridge long since pointed out, the effect of the uniformity of Nature is this; it excites expectation; it inspires a sense of security; it quickens hope: that is to say, it causes the very emotions in us which find expression in Prayer—*hope, expectation, desire.*

But consider also that, while there is much in Nature which speaks of law and uniformity, there is much that suggests the action of a Free Will which is not in bondage to Law. As yet, at least,

we cannot reduce *all* the natural facts and phenomena to laws that we can formulate, and on which we may act with certainty. Great as are the advances of science, no man can predict what the weather will be to-morrow, nor whether this year's harvest will be as abundant as the last. And the true test of science is prediction. We *can* predict that two and two will in all cases make four, unless indeed the laws of human thought should ever be radically altered, and that the angles of every triangle will always be equal to two right angles. But who can predict the changes in the atmosphere of the sun, or even in that of the earth? And wherever *life* enters into and complicates the phenomena which science sets itself to investigate and reduce to law, it is at fault. Thus, for example, as Sir George Cornewall Lewis has observed, although men have so profound an interest in all that relates to health, medical science is an important exception to the rule that "the physical are better ascertained than the moral sciences." So little faith indeed have the ablest physicians in their own art, that it is a question whether anything worthy of the name of medical *science* really exists. And in proportion as the form of life rises—from physical to intellectual, from intellectual to moral, from moral to spiritual life—the power and scope of science are still more limited and imperfect. Men of science, indeed, constantly assume that, since we are able to classify and arrange many of the facts of Nature under certain laws, so, as our knowledge grows from less to more, all the facts will fall either under the laws already formulated or under some still wider generalizations. And probably they are right, in so far

as the *physical* universe is concerned. All that I now wish to point out is, that this assumption is only an assumption for the present, and that therefore they have no right to speak as if they carried the key of the whole universe in their private pocket. They are very ready to charge us with anthropomorphism, with making a god in our own likeness; but, if it were worth while, it would be easy to retort the charge, and to shew that, simply because *they* can see nothing but Law in the universe, they assume that God must be made after *their* image, and that He must be just as incapable of rising to any higher conception as they are themselves. If, indeed, men were crystals, or trees, or even stars; if, in short, they were merely material creatures without intelligence and will, it might be that the whole round of their motives and actions should be ruled by law. But as men have intelligence and will and affection; as God, if He be good, must desire to see them good; as they can only become good by the free action of their own will—compulsory goodness being no goodness—it may be that we should look to the *human* world rather than to the natural world for hints as to the methods by which God rules and shapes our lives. And this human world, the world of thought, emotion, volition, is infinitely more complex and subtle than the physical world, and does not lend itself so easily to the rigid conceptions and stingy alternatives of the Uniformitarian school. Indeed, we see how ill it fares with them when they attempt to deal, on their own principles merely, with even a single human soul. Critics of this school have taken Shakespeare in hand, for instance. They have as-

sumed that *his* creations are all governed by laws which they have discovered and formulated; and that when you have ascertained the leading motive of any one of his works, or *worlds* as we might rather call them, and know how to apply their laws to it, you have the key to all that it contains. Each drama, according to them, has its ruling motive, and every action and incident in it—*i.e.*, all the inhabitants and events of this lesser world—contribute to work it out. And so they come, with their laws of Shakespeare, and apply them to this drama and to that, authoritatively pronounce that this passage is not from his hand nor that, that this part and that must have been interpolated by a foreign pen :—dealing with our great poet, in fact, very much as their kindred critics have dealt with the books of Scripture, contradicting one another at every step, and involving themselves in the most admired confusion. Mean time the empire of Shakespeare standeth sure; and what his critics most clearly prove, is that they and their laws are far too petty to comprehend him.

But if one man is not to be thus brought under laws that we can trace and tabulate, how is the whole world of men? That the Uniformitarians have failed, utterly and completely failed, in dealing with this larger world, only grows the more apparent the longer we consider them and their works. They have assumed, as I have said, that the reign of law is fatal to prayer, and that we must choose between Law and Caprice, no other alternative being open to us. But if it be impossible for God to answer prayer, must it not be equally impossible for man to answer it, since man is at least more clearly the subject of

Law than He who made and rules the universe? And yet is it impossible for man?

Consider our human relations; reflect on what we know of human action and motive: and then say whether these assumptions can be sustained. Does uniformity of action drive us from prayer? Is it not, rather, an indispensable condition of prayer and a direct encouragement to it? In the administration of public justice, for example, what is it that makes every man bold to bring his suit into court, and to seek redress for any wrong that has been done him? It is simply that he believes the administration of justice to be tolerably uniform, inflexible, invariable. If the judges were notoriously open to bribes, if they were at the beck of the sovereign, if they courted the favour of the mob, we should no longer be able to calculate on them; we should be afraid to carry to them our prayers for redress. It is the very uniformity and steadfastness of the administration of justice which impresses and invites us to appeal to it. So far from hindering us, it is this very superiority to change and caprice which begets confidence and moves us to carry our suits before the public magistrate. If our judges were Turks, instead of Englishmen, could we possibly appeal to them with the same confidence? And yet in the face of all this our Uniformitarian friends assume, without any attempt at proof, that if we confess that God rules the world by laws which are uniform in their action and regular and invariable, we must also confess that it is unreasonable to pray to Him, that we can only take our suits to Him so long as we conceive of Him as actuated by Caprice, and capable of being moved

to favouritism by bribes, by flatteries, by importunities and tears! In short, they quietly assume that in our intercourse with God we shall be actuated by motives the very opposite of those which govern us in our dealings with men!

2. But if uniformity, instead of being fatal to it, is the very life of prayer, is their second assumption any truer than the first? They assume, as we have seen, that the world *must* be ruled either by Law or by Caprice, that no other alternative is open to us. But is that true? A judge, who would be equitable, cannot always observe the strict letter of the law. Human actions and motives are too subtle and complex to be brought fairly under the operation of inelastic inflexible rules. But when a judge departs from the mere letter, or the exact requirements, of the law, is he necessarily moved to it by mere caprice? On the contrary he may be, and commonly is, moved by equity, by the desire to do a higher justice than he could do were he to abide by the mere letter of the law. A man *can* answer prayer, then, simply by a wise and just administration of law; and yet we are required to believe that God *cannot!* A man is *not* shut up to the choice between Law and Caprice; and yet we are required to believe that God *is!* A man, so far from indulging an unreasonable caprice, may be moved by equity, by an honourable desire that the real ends of law should be reached, to break through the restraints of law; and yet, without an atom of proof, we are required to believe that God can only be moved by caprice should He act in any but a strictly legal way! Is, then, equity impossible to God, or love?

Take another illustration. A master who employs a great number of workmen, if he be wise and kind, will have certain definite modes or rules of action, rules which he will expect all in his employ to observe, and which he himself will be forward both to observe and to maintain. No large business, indeed, can be carried on successfully except by regular and uniform methods of procedure. But does this uniformity of action and rule prove fatal to any reasonable request? On the contrary, the men who serve such a master as this soon "know where to have him;" *i.e.*, they learn what they may ask of him with a good hope of having their request granted, and what it will be utterly in vain for them to ask. If he were the mere fool of caprice and passion, they could have no such reasonable and assured expectation. They would hardly care to prefer any request, however reasonable it might be, simply because, as he did not act on reason and principle, they could never be sure that it would not be met with an irrational and arbitrary refusal. So that here, again, uniformity is the very life of prayer, the very ground of that confident "anticipation which is both wind and sails to the movements of the mind."[1] Why, then, should *God's* adherence to rule, to principle, to law, prove

[1] The phrase is from Edward Irving, who, like myself, uses the idea of Coleridge, and, alas,—for I hold Irving to have been the greatest religious orator of modern times, with most of prophetic insight and spirit and style—*spoils* it, by substituting "the constancy of God's promises" for "the uniformity of Nature's operation," as "giving aim and calculation and certainty to events" in the domain of the intellect and will and spirit. Despite this substitution of the promises for the character of God—as if He were bound only by his word—no man can read Irving's magnificent discourses on Prayer, in vol. iii. of his "Collected Writings," without learning much from them, and being afresh impressed with the wonderful power of his eloquence. His speech is like "the large utterance" of the gods.

fatal to our prayers, to any reasonable request which we may carry to his feet?

If, moreover, the master, the head of a great establishment, be sincerely bent on promoting the welfare of those whom he employs, will he not willingly modify the operations of his rules in order to meet their varying wants and conditions? Will he not at times go beyond the scope of his own rules in order to shew a considerate kindness to those who serve him, and who need that this or that rule should be relaxed? Is the only alternative with *him*, Law or Caprice? If, for the good of any of those who depend upon him, he does relax or modify the operation of rule, are we to charge him with a capricious lawlessness fatal to the welfare of the rest? May not his motive be a virtuous one? May it not be a sincere regard for the welfare of his servants? Why, then, are we to assume that God has no alternative but the observance of rule or the indulgence of caprice? May not He also shew a kindness above and beyond that of law?

Take a final illustration from family life. A wise and good father, that he may have an orderly and happy household, frames methods of household action and order by which for the most part he steadfastly abides. But does his regular observance of rule, his demand that his children should also observe it, hinder them from ever coming to him with a request, or prevent him from ever granting it? On the contrary it begets in them a confident expectation that he will listen to their reasonable requests. They feel the wisdom and goodness of his laws; but they also feel that, because he is wise and good, he will modify,

or transcend, his laws in order to meet any emergency that may arise, to supply their wants, to promote their welfare. It is only in those ill-guided and unhappy households in which the parents are actuated, not by rule and principle, but by passion and impulse, that the children feel it is no use to ask anything, however reasonable, and form the habit of acting for themselves. So that here, again, the regular operation of law, so far from proving fatal to prayer, guides and inspires it. The children know what to ask for; and if, in answer to their requests, the father modifies or transcends the household rules, they do not dream of charging him with caprice: they recognize the love which prompts him now to abide by his rules and now to suspend or to depart from them on touch of need.

And what I want to know, what I think the Uniformitarians are bound to tell us, is: Why, if in all provinces of human action, uniformity, what we call an invariable adherence to law, begets that confident expectation and hope which find expression in prayer, *God's* uniform administration of law should push us from his feet, and close the lips which we had opened in supplication before Him? To me it seems that his steadfast adherence to law should rather be the very ground and life and inspiration of prayer. Because He is not changeable, we should know, if in such a connection I may use the colloquialism, "where to have Him;" we should know what to ask that He will be sure to grant, and what it will be wholly in vain for us to ask. Because He is of an inflexible justice, we should confidently bring our suits to Him, assured that He will do us right. Because He is a wise and

considerate Master and a most righteous tender Father, we should lay our needs and wishes before Him, with a sure and certain hope that through the operation of law or by transcending law, by granting or by refusing our requests, He will give us all that we really need.

And, finally, I think we have a right to ask this question: If in all departments of human life we find that men can depart from the strict observance of law without sinking into caprice, nay, may thus rise to an exhibition of equity, of kindness, of love; why are we to concede the assumption that God's sole alternative is Law or Caprice? On what ground are we asked to admit that *He* can never suspend, or modify, or transcend the operation of his laws except at the prompting of a blind and unreasonable impulse? Surely equity, kindness, love, are not impossible to Him. And if they are not, we *must* traverse the fundamental assumption of the Uniformitarian School; we must affirm that God is neither the slave of his laws nor the sport of an arbitrary caprice; but a Judge who loves righteousness, a Master who rules by serving, and a Father who loves us with a pure and all-transcending affection. CARPUS.

THE GOSPEL OF THE UNCIRCUMCISION.

CHRISTIANITY was introduced into the world, not as an absolutely new religion, but as the development and fulfilment of Judaism. Its Founder was initiated into the Jewish covenant by circumcision; He was baptized by John the Baptist on the ground that it was becoming that He should fulfil all the outward

observances pertaining to a religious life; and He kept the feasts which a pious Israelite was bound to keep. Outwardly, therefore, He appeared before his countrymen as one of themselves; and when He began to teach He was regarded not as the author of a new religion, but as one who professed to have been anointed by the Holy Spirit for the purpose of proclaiming good news of deliverance from certain evils. And in his earliest public teaching He appears to have anticipated the objection that He was setting Himself in opposition to the established religion. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." Not to destroy (*καταλῦσαι*), that is, not to overthrow suddenly and violently, as the Temple was overthrown by the Romans (cf. Matt. xxiv. 2, *καταλυθήσεται*), but to fulfil (*πληρῶσαι*), that is, to fill up that which before was empty; to conduct it to its full accomplishment by bringing in the higher law on which the law and the prophets depend. But this fulfilment involved an important change in the position of the Law, for the interest which attaches to a prediction or a promise before it is fulfilled is quite different from that which we feel about it afterwards: it is a past rather than a present interest which now belongs to it. We may retain the promissory note after the money has been paid, but if we do, it is in order that we may possess a record of the whole transaction, no longer as a valuable security.

And in accordance with this principle, we find that Christ in his public teaching refers but rarely to the Law, and when He does, He either speaks of it as holding an inferior position to his teaching—"It was

said by them of old time; . . . but I say unto you;" . . . "Moses because of the hardness of your heart gave you this precept;" "In this place is one greater than the Sabbath"—or else He selects from it an isolated precept, which He adopts as the one great commandment on which the rest depend. Indeed, there is very little in the oral teaching of Christ, so far as it has come down to us, that would not be as intelligible to a person ignorant of the Old Testament as it was to the Jews to whom it was addressed.

Not so, however, is it with the teaching of the Apostles. Both in their spoken words as recorded in the Acts, and in their written Epistles, we find frequent, and in some cases abstruse, references to the Old Testament; minute illustrations, quotations sometimes turning on a word, and, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, elaborate parallels between the Jewish ceremonial and the Christian doctrine. Unlike the Gospels, the Epistles would be to a considerable extent unintelligible without a knowledge of the Jewish system. And from this it has resulted, quite naturally, that the Christian Church has always sought in the Old Testament for precedents for her observances, for illustrations of her teaching, and even for direct anticipations of her doctrine. On the Sabbath of the seventh day has been based the observance of the first day of the week; in the Jewish priesthood has been seen, under various forms it is true, the Christian hierarchy; in the laying of the high priest's hands on the head of the scapegoat, while he confessed the sins of the people, has been recognized the vicarious aspect of the Atonement. How far Christian theology has

been coloured by purely Jewish elements is indeed an intricate question, and one which has as yet received but very inadequate discussion; but it would be well if the Christian Church would attempt some solution of the question,—a very practical one for English Christians in the present day,—If St. Paul should come among us now, would he enforce upon our missionary societies the necessity of instructing native converts in Hindostan, in New Zealand, and in Africa, in the history and literature and ritual of the Hebrew nation, before they could be considered more than babes in Christ? or would he pronounce that after eighteen centuries Christianity is able to run alone, and that while there is much in Moses and the Prophets and in the Psalms that is imperishable because it is human, there is much also that is separable from Christianity because it is Jewish? Are we to suppose that if St. Paul were writing to a Christian Church now he would write precisely as he did to the Churches of Rome or of Galatia; or may we construct a kind of proportion, and say, That as was the first century to the nineteenth, so would St. Paul's teaching to the Christians of the first century be to his teaching to those of the nineteenth?

It is at least worth observing that we find in the writings of the Apostles no trace of any idea that they were writing for future ages; indeed, their whole thought of the future seems to have concentrated itself in the looking for the day of Christ. Unless, therefore, we hold that the form as well as the substance of their writings is the direct utterance of the Divine Spirit, there can be nothing in such an inquiry inconsistent with the truest reverence for Scripture.

There is a remarkable passage in the second chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians, which has an important bearing on this subject. St. Paul declares that the Gospel of the Uncircumcision (*εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἀκροβυστίας*) was committed to him, and the Gospel of the Circumcision (*εὐαγγέλιον τῆς περιτομῆς*) to Peter. Professor Lightfoot, indeed, than whom there can hardly be a higher authority, says that this denotes a distinction of sphere and not of type, quoting the words of Tertullian, "Inter se distributionem officii ordinaverunt, non separationem evangelii, nec ut *aliud* alter sed ut *aliis* alter prædicarent" (They arranged between them a distribution of their work, not a division of the gospel, nor so that they should preach different matter, but only to different classes). But the phrase, *πεπίστευμαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον* (I was put in trust with the Gospel), like the one quoted by Dr. Lightfoot to illustrate it, *ἐπιστεύθησαν τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ* (To them were committed—or, literally, They were put in trust with—the oracles of God), refers, not to an office or an energy, but a subject. The *εὐαγγέλιον* is the matter of the good news, not the act of proclaiming it, for which another word (*κήρυγμα*, or rather *κήρυξις*) would be more appropriate. And therefore, if St. Paul's words are to be accepted literally, the Gospel of the Circumcision is not the task of preaching to the Gentiles, but the Circumcision's Gospel, the good tidings to be preached to them, and it is distinguished from the Uncircumcision's Gospel, or the good tidings to be preached to the Gentiles. It is therefore a question which fairly arises from his own words, Did St. Paul recognize any, and if so, what, difference between the

subject-matter to be preached to the Jews and that to be preached to the Gentiles?

But we are met at once by the objection, Granting for a moment that this is so, still remember it is St. Paul himself that is entrusted with the Gospel of the Uncircumcision, and therefore this is the Gospel that we practically possess in his teaching. True; and it is not improbable that the teaching of the Apostles of Jerusalem differed more or less widely from that of the Apostle of the Gentiles in respect of breadth and comprehensiveness. But beyond this, may we not trace in the teaching of St. Paul himself a difference, not indeed of doctrine, but of treatment and illustration, according as he is addressing Jews or Gentiles? Take, on the one hand, his address to the Jews in the synagogue at Antioch, and, on the other, those to the simple pagans of Lystra and the philosophic idolaters of Athens. In the first, he bases himself, as Stephen had done, on the past history of the nation. He speaks of the exodus, of the wandering in the wilderness, of Saul and of David. The good tidings that he proclaims is that God had fulfilled the promise made to the fathers of Israel. He quotes the Psalms and refers to the prophets. To the Lystrans he speaks of the living God, who made heaven and earth and the sea; he speaks of the rain and the seasons, the outward nature with which they were familiar; and if it is too much to say, with M. Renan, "L'effort des apôtres, quand ils prêchaient à des populations de ce genre, était moins de prêcher Jésus que de prêcher Dieu," we may at least say that their object was rather to preach Jesus the Saviour of all men, than

Christ the Messiah of the Jews. To the Athenians he declares that the unknown God, whom already they ignorantly worshipped, was indeed the God who had made the world and all things therein, and in whom they themselves lived and moved and had their being. He quotes not the Hebrew prophets, but their own poet Aratus, and he tells them how God had made all nations of men from one blood. But to neither the one audience nor the other does he say anything of the Jewish law, or speak of Christianity as in any way dependent on Judaism, or of the Gentiles as having to link themselves on to the past of Judaism before they can become really Christians. And in his Epistles we see the same distinction. Setting aside for a moment the Epistle to the Hebrews, as being almost certainly not St. Paul's, and the Epistles to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon, as addressed to individuals and therefore not bearing on the question, we may almost gauge the relative proportions of the Jewish and Gentile elements in the several Churches by the amount of reference in the Epistles addressed to them to the Jewish law and ritual. In every Church, indeed, the two elements must have coexisted; but in the Epistles to Thessalonica and Corinth there is almost nothing of argument or illustration based upon Jewish history or ritual, while in those to the Romans and Galatians we seem to recognize in the elaborate argument to prove that Abraham was justified by faith, and in the remarkable passage in which Hagar and Sarah are made types of the old and new Covenants, an indication that the Apostle had in his mind Jewish converts, to whom the

familiar ideas of the Hebrew Scriptures would at once appeal, like the sound of some well-known tune. Still more do we find this in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Whoever may have been its author—and the profoundest critics of the present day gravitate more and more towards Luther's happy conjecture that it was written by Apollos—its title, "To the Hebrews," is incontrovertible. And further, it is generally agreed that the Epistle was addressed, not to the Hebrew Christians at large—the numerous special references, as Chapter vi. Verses 10–12, and Chapter xiii. Verses 19, 23, 24, make this view untenable—but to the Hebrew element in a particular Christian community, whether in Asia Minor, Rome, Jerusalem, or Alexandria. Indeed, the main argument of the dogmatic portion of the Epistle, that Christ has received a higher priesthood than that of Aaron, is one which would not need to be enforced upon Gentile Christians. When the writer, in the latter part of the Epistle, quits this subject and turns to the subject of faith, summoning as witnesses to the power of this great principle the heroes of the old Covenant, then indeed he makes us feel at once that the Christian Church without the Jewish would be imperfect; and that just as America claims an equal share with ourselves in the glories of old England, so we Christians claim our part in Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in Moses, in Gideon, and Barak, and Samson, and Jephthah, in David also, and Samuel, and the prophets. But just as an American citizen, unless he is studying constitutional history, may be pardoned if he takes but little interest in the origin and history of the English borough franchise, although

that very franchise may have preserved in dark days the spirit of liberty which was the seed of the great Republic of the West, so a modern Christian, who seeks in his Bible instruction in righteousness rather than in theology, will find that he instinctively passes somewhat lightly over the earlier Chapters of this Epistle, to dwell with delight upon the last five. Indeed, let preachers and theologians say what they will, there is in the spiritual life of every simple Christian an unconscious process of natural selection, by which he assimilates to himself those portions of Scripture which he finds nourish him, and passes by those which do not speak so directly to his heart.

The cry for "Christianity without Judaism" is no doubt apt to be a fallacious and a dangerous one. It is not an uncommon artifice to class together among inherited Jewish superstitions many truths or aspects of truth which, rightly viewed, would be found full of precious spiritual import. But on the other hand it is no uncommon thing to meet with systems of Christian doctrine in which the pure ore of gospel truth seems to have been melted down and cast in a Jewish mould; in which, if the substance is Christian, the form and colour are of the old Covenant. Take, for example, the great critical instance of the Atonement. That the good Shepherd layeth down his life on behalf of the sheep—that Christ died on behalf of our sins according to the Old Testament Scripture—that the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin—this is what no Christian soul could do without; it is the very life of the soul. But theologians have not been content to feed upon this truth: they must analyze it, define it, discover pre-

cisely what it is in the Atonement that affects our relation to God. And this they have done for the most part by hardening into literal prosaic fact the figures, the shadows, the allusions which they found in the writings of the old Covenant and in the ritual of the Jewish Church. That the ordinances, the sacrifices, the types of the old dispensation, were intended to bring the Jews to Christ—to educate them up to Him—is most true: they were a shadow of things to come. But when the substance is present, we do not turn to the shadow in order to get a clear idea of its outline. We correct the shadow by the substance, not the substance by the shadow. And, therefore, while in writing to Hebrews it was natural to adduce the fact that under the Law there was no remission of ceremonial guilt without shedding of blood in illustration of the infinitely nobler and more spiritual sacrifice which began in the Incarnation and found its highest expression in the death of Christ, to found upon this text the inference that God required blood-shedding as an antecedent condition of the remission of sins, is surely to invert the relative positions of the old and new Covenants, and to take Moses as the interpreter of Christ, instead of Christ as the fulfilment of Moses.

Is it, then, the office of the Christian expositor to eliminate from the Mosaic system certain inferior and carnal constituents, unworthy of the more spiritual revelation which we possess in Christianity? Far from it. Christ came not to destroy, but to fulfil; not to evacuate the old Covenant, but to spiritualize it, to lift it to a higher level, to bring out of the letter that killeth the spirit that giveth life. "The Old

Testament is not contrary to the New," but it is inferior and subordinate to it. There are, indeed, phases of spiritual life, both in Churches and in individuals, in which what may be called Jewish aspects of religious truths assume a disproportionate importance. There are minds, and there have been periods in the Church's history, in which what may be called the propitiatory aspect of the Atonement has well-nigh eclipsed all others; there are expositors of Christian doctrine, especially in the coarser forms of revivalism, in which this tremendous mystery is set forth as a *quid pro quo*, a bare compensation. And this produces a reaction, and a denial of any propitiatory element in it. But it is truer to say that it contains this and much more; that we can never exhaust its import; that the Atonement, like the love of Christ of which it is the expression, passeth knowledge; that whatever view of the Atonement meets a need of the human soul is a true view, but that it is hardly given to any one Christian soul to embrace its entire import; that we must endeavour to comprehend with *all* saints—with the saints of the old and of the new Covenant; with the saints of Calvinism and of Arminianism; with the saints of Catholicism and of Protestantism—what is the length and breadth and depth and height; and that only so may we hope to be filled with all the fulness of God.

And so we come round at last to the higher truth, that the Gospel of the Circumcision and the Gospel of the Uncircumcision are not after all two, but one; that they are two, indeed, so long as we insist upon making them two—two to the Jewish Christian who

cannot enter into the breadth of the new revelation; two to the Gentile Christian who impatiently refuses to see anything in the old Covenant but an effete national superstition; but that they are one if we will only rise to the serener heights where they meet, where, that which is perfect being come, that which is in part is done away; where there is neither circumcision nor uncircumcision, but Christ is all and in all.

R. E. BARTLETT.

A CHAPTER OF GOSPEL HISTORY.

7.—THE SELF-ESTIMATE OF JESUS.

(*St. Matthew* xi. 27.)

THIS outstanding text, to which Keim has given the not inappropriate title of the Great Sonship Confession of Jesus, has from the earliest times attracted the attention of students of the Gospel history; and it was never an object of greater interest to theologians than it is at present. The saying of our Lord here recorded, and found also in the Third Gospel,[1] is invested with exceptional importance, both on doctrinal and on critical grounds. The striking resemblance between this Synoptical word and the utterances put into the mouth of Jesus by the Fourth Evangelist has already been adverted to in the first paper of this series. In view of this resemblance it seems natural to think that here, in this one precious text, we have a hint of a doctrine concerning the Person of the Speaker, rising above the general Synoptical level into the high mysterious region of truth in which John soars on eagle wing.

[1] Luke x. 21.

Then it happens that the text before us is one of those about which much diversity of opinion has prevailed as to the correct reading. Not that the available critical authorities, in the shape of ancient MSS. of the Greek text, are at variance here. The source of dubiety lies nearer the fountain-head than the date of our oldest uncials, even among the Fathers of the second and third centuries. There is a very great unsteadiness in the form in which the text is quoted, as any one may see by consulting the work of Dr. Westcott on the "Canon of the New Testament."[1] All the varieties may be reduced under two types, one being the form in which the passage is given in all modern editions of the Greek Testament, and the other that which may conveniently be distinguished as the form in favour with, though not confined to, the Gnostic heretics. The latter ran thus: "All things have been given unto me by my Father, and no one *knew* the Father except the Son, and the Son except the Father, and he to whom He (the Son) reveals;" the outstanding points of difference being the use of the past tense "knew" (ἔγνω) instead of the present "knoweth" (γινώσκει or ἐπιγινώσκει), and the inversion of the second and third clauses of the sentence, the knowledge possessed by the Son of the Father being placed before the knowledge possessed by the Father of the Son.

The critical question is, Which of these two types is to be preferred? Patristic authority can be quoted in favour of what we have distinguished as the heretical reading. Justin Martyr, *e.g.*, in his first "Apology," gives the text in Greek exactly as the

[1] *Vide* p. 134 (fourth edition), note, where is given a table of variations.

above rendering requires it to be,[1] though elsewhere coming a little nearer our canonical text by the use of the present tense of the verb To know. The same form occurs in the writings of Clement of Alexandria and of Origen. The relation of Irenæus to the question is peculiar and important. He quotes the text in one place substantially as it occurs in our Greek Testament, and then goes on to refer to some who, thinking themselves wiser than the apostles, read the text the other way ("No man *knew* the Father," &c.); assigning as their reason for altering the words a desire to draw from them the inference that before Christ's time no one knew the Father, that the doctrine of God's Fatherhood was not contained in the Old Testament, and that Jesus Christ first made it known, which is the well-known view of Marcion.[2] In another place Irenæus indicates that those he had in view as corrupters or false interpreters of the text were the Marcosians.[3] It is in this way we know that the reading in question was in favour with Gnostic heretics, and the use they made of it. But the curious thing is that the same Father, in a passage in the same chapter in which he animadverts on those who would be wiser than the apostles, again quotes the text in the form preferred by the heretics, with the exception that he uses the present tense of the verb To know.

From the facts just stated, and others of similar import, certain inferences have been drawn. The author of "Supernatural Religion" avails himself of

[1] *Apologia*, i. 63. Οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς, οὐδὲ τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ, καὶ οἷς ἂν ἀποκαλύψῃ ὁ υἱός.

[2] *Contra Hæreses*, lib. i. c. xx.

[3] Ibid. lib. iv. c. vi. 3.

the facts relating to Justin's way of quoting the text as an argument in support of his position that the famous Apologist of the second century was not acquainted with our canonical Gospels, but quoted from earlier forms of the Gospels, no longer extant. Keim, on the other hand, from the whole facts regarding early patristic usage in reference to this text, draws the inference that the "heretical" type, as we have called it, comes nearer the original form of the saying as recorded in the early copies of our Gospels than the one with which we are familiar, which he thinks owes its origin to an increasing desire in the Church to glorify Jesus as a superhuman Being, and to remove from the words whatever had been used by heretics in support of their obnoxious opinions. His view on the question in dispute, in his own words,[1] is as follows. "'All is given over to me by my Father, and no one knew thoroughly the Father except the Son, and the Son except the Father, and to whom He reveals it.' So must the oft-quoted, but also the, through reflection, much corrupted, word of Jesus, originally have sounded. The present prevailing text of our Gospels is the remotest from the original: it contains a word of Jesus artificially altered for his glorification." He goes on to say that the other reading, well attested by the Fathers of the second century, and down even to those of the fifth, is to be preferred to the current one, because the latter became current in the close of the second century through the desire to honour Jesus and to obviate the hated inferences of the Gnostics with respect to the knowledge of the true

[1] *Ein künstliches Verherrlichungswort Jesu.*

God. He does not, however, think that even the early patristic reading is quite correct. The true reading, though little supported, he holds to be: "No one knew the Father except the Son, nor did any one know the Son except the Father, and he to whom He (the Father, not He the Son) will reveal it." [1]

This view of Keim's seems based on dogmatic prejudice. It may be true, as he says, that the whole question as to the right reading is a comparatively small one; but it is manifest, from the reasons which he assigns for his rpeference of the antiquated reading, that the question is not a small one to him. He tacitly admits that the text, as it now stands, involves, when naturally interpreted, very remarkable pretensions on the part of Jesus; and it is on the ground of these pretensions that he regards the approved text with suspicion and aversion. To an unbiassed consideration it must appear that the text as it stands fits in most naturally to the circumstances amidst which the words were spoken. Jesus, rejected of men, falls back upon the comforting consciousness that his Father in heaven thoroughly knows Him, though the wise and prudent do not. It is natural that He should speak first of the Father's knowledge of Him, and of that knowledge in the present tense. It is equally natural that He should next speak of his knowledge of the Father, and of his importance as the medium through whom that knowledge comes to other men. It belongs to the situation that the despised One should not only comfort Himself with the thought, "My Father knows me," but

[1] *Jesu von Nazara*, ii. 380, 381.

that He should assert his own importance as the medium through whom God is made known to the world. We therefore cordially concur in the opinion expressed by another German theologian, who is as free a critic of the Gospel history as Keim himself, and who expresses his view to the following effect. "The canonical text of the word in Matthew xi. 27 has its guarantee, not only in its being found in the earlier Fathers alongside of the then current transformed reading, but very specially in its historical character. The word of Jesus contains, not a history of revelation, but a mirror of his own experience; and because He starts from this, He begins with the thesis, No man knoweth the Son except the Father. So soon as men began to use the whole text for doctrinal purposes, the changes which adapted it to that purpose began to be made. The clauses were inverted and the tense changed, and the result was a word indicating Christ's position in the history of revelation."[1] It is only needful to realize the position in which Christ found Himself at the moment, to feel the justness of these observations. If, however, some additional evidence be desiderated to shew the naturalness of the turn Christ's thought took at this point, when He gratefully reflected on the Father's intimate knowledge of Himself in presence of the unbelief and ignorance of men, we might refer to a somewhat parallel instance. Recall the word spoken by the Son of Man when He was blamed for receiving publicans and sinners, and eating with them. "Joy shall be *in heaven* over one sinner repenting, more than over ninety and nine just persons, that

[1] Weizäcker, *Untersuchungen über die Evangelische Geschichte*, p. 433, note.

need no repentance."[1] Why say, *In heaven?* why not rather say, *I* have peculiar joy in seeing even one obscure insignificant sinner repenting? That was what his position as one whose conduct was misunderstood required Him to say: why, then, instead of saying that, does He make this didactic statement about the way in which Heaven regards the penitent? Just because He is misunderstood, completely and hopelessly misunderstood. With his back to the wall, so to speak, He asks Himself, Where shall I go in quest of beings who feel as I feel? Pharisees simply despise the degraded, and are incapable of conceiving so much as the possibility of a love like that I cherish toward the sinful and the miserable. Sadducees think it does not matter whether men repent or not; it will be all the same how men live, seventy years hence. If they think they make themselves happier by indulging in vice, why then let them. Nowhere on earth can I find beings that feel as I feel, or can understand or conceive my feelings; but in heaven, yes, in heaven, they understand me; in heaven they feel as I feel. There is joy in heaven, I tell you, over sinners repenting; and the joy of heaven is mine. In the case before us, Jesus is similarly situated, and seeks similar consolation. Conscious that He is despised and rejected by the wise and prudent, by all his contemporaries with the exception of a few babes, He lifts his thoughts upward, and says, There is One that knows me thoroughly, One whom the wise and prudent wish to know, and think they know, but whom no one knows who rejects me; for, despised though I

[1] Luke xv. 7.

be, I am the medium through whom He is made known to the world.

With these observations on the critical question as to the correct text, we pass to the more important question, What is the doctrinal import of this very remarkable utterance of Christ? A full history of the interpretation of the passage cannot here be given, but it may be instructive to notice briefly two of the most recent attempts to explain the words on the part of writers who either deny altogether the Catholic doctrine concerning Christ's person, or refuse to admit that that doctrine has any footing in the Synoptical Gospels—Keim and Ritschl. Adopting the reading approved by the Gnostics, Keim expounds it as follows:—"Whichever form of the text we adopt, we find therein the glory of Christ, and a great testimony, and personal testimony, in reference to his whole position. All is given to Him by his Father, that is, the God whom He here for the first time distinctly calls his Father in contrast to all other men. The all things given are primarily those babes, the kernel of the people to whom the Father has shewn the Son; but likewise all Messianic rights among men, which the faith of the people legitimizes, and the unbelief of the wise avails not to frustrate. But what precisely are those mysterious intangible Messianic rights? He tells us plainly in the sequel. No one knew the Father except the Son, and the Son except the Father, and he to whom He reveals. His right, his privilege, his singularity lies, above all, in the through Him for the first time completed knowledge of the Father, in his being known by the Father, and in his becoming known to the humanity

whom the Father gives Him, whilst He gives to it the knowledge of the Son. It is, in short, the representation of the highest spiritual truths, as the exclusive mediator of which He, at once Revealer and Revealed, is appointed for a believing obedient world of men. In this mighty thesis lie three mighty utterances. He is the first and only One who through Himself and through God has reached the knowledge of God the Father; that knowledge which no Abraham, no Moses, no David, no Solomon, no Isaiah, no Daniel, not to say no wisdom of the contemporary wise, had discovered. In the second place, as He knows God, so God has known Him. He has known God as Father, as Father of men, and yet more as his own Father. God has known Him as Son, as Son among many, and yet more as the One among many, and exclusively related to each other. Each to the other a holy, worthy to be known, searched out, discovered secret, they (Father and Son) incline towards each other with love, to discover each other, to enjoy each other with self-satisfying delight, resting on equality of spiritual activity, of being, of nature. In the third place, this self-contained world of Father and Son opens itself to the lower world, to men, only by a free act, because they are pleased to open themselves up and to admit whom they choose to fellowship; and because the Fathe ris even still greater than the Son, even when the Son upon earth speaks to the ears of men, so it is finally not the Son but the Father who is the decisive Revealer, interpreting to the spirits and hearts of men the Son, and in the Son Himself admitting the babes, excluding the wise and knowing."[1] As if

[1] *Jesu von Nazara*, ii. 381.

feeling the need for a simpler statement, the author remarks further on: "This place is, as no other, the interpreter of the Messiah-thought of Jesus. If we desire to reduce it to its simplest expression, it may be said that Jesus sought his Messiahship in his world-historical spiritual achievement, that He mediated for humanity the highest knowledge of God and the most complete blessed life in God."[1] It is clear from all this that the writer we have been quoting is wading in waters beyond his depth. How mystical, how unintelligible, the second of the three thoughts he finds in the text, *on the assumption made by Keim, that the Speaker is no more than man, and is distinguished from other men only by his more intimate knowledge of God, and more intimate confidential fellowship with God, a knowledge and a fellowship not even in his case absolutely perfect.* Christ, we are to understand, was entitled to speak as He does here because He first taught men to regard God as Father, and first Himself entered fully into the spirit of the relation between God and men expressed by the terms Father and Son. That is what all his mystic phraseology comes to, as the author admits when he says that we may homologate all Christ here claims if we acknowledge only the general fact that He was the Inbringer of a higher, more satisfying religion, the religion of Christians—the worship of the Father in spirit and in truth. Thus by big words and inflated phrases do writers of this school endeavour to affirm, while denying, all the supernatural phenomena in Christ's history—his divine nature, his miracles, his resurrection. If any one desires to see another

[1] *Jesu von Nazara*, ii. 384.

sample, let him peruse the account of the resurrection of Jesus given by another member of the same school, Ewald, in his "History of Christ and his Time," concerning which account Strauss remarks with characteristic frankness and with perfect truth, that it does not contain a fragment of an idea which he himself had not uttered in his *Leben Jesu*, though "certainly with far less unction." Strauss, not Keim or Ewald, is the truest exponent of naturalism, and if one is not allowed by his philosophy to find more in our text than Keim finds in it, it would be far better, with the first-named writer, to deny the genuineness of the saying on the ground of its mystic, pretentious, and superhuman character, than with the second to retain it as the unnatural extravagant utterance of one who was neither more nor less than the first teacher of a new and comparatively excellent religion.

Ritschl's interpretation of the text is even more unsatisfactory than the one just considered. While in Keim's paraphrase we recognize in the very straining and elaboration of the style an involuntary testimony to the truth that the words of Christ contain more than his philosophy can receive; in Ritschl's we have some difficulty in discovering more than the perverse whim of a man bent on achieving distinction by singularity in his exegetical views. The first clause of our text, "All things are delivered unto me of my Father," according to this author, points simply to that power over the world which comes through spirituality of mind, and which is evinced by patience under the various ills of life. These words of Jesus are parallel to those of Paul,

"All things are yours," and He claims for Himself no more than is true in measure of every Christian man. The peculiarity of the Christian religion consists in this, that the man whom God knows, and who in turn fully knows God, maintains power over the world. He has overcome the world, He is independent of the world: the world, its ambitions, its rewards, its threats, have no power over him. Christ's personal service consisted in inaugurating such a religion, a religion in which the dominion of the supra-mundane God is set free from national and political limits, as well as from the expectation of material well-being, and God is set forth as a purely spiritual being, and as the object of love and worship to spiritual beings. And because in this service of his life He was at once the Revealer of God in the full sense, and the Man who honoured God and served God up to the full measure of his knowledge of God, it was only natural that He should claim for Himself a position towards the world corresponding to the idea of the one true God, and to the worth of the spiritual kingdom of God. This being the import of the text, according to Ritschl, we are not surprised by the interpretation which he puts upon the gracious invitation to the labouring and heavy laden with which the Chapter closes. The two theologians whose views we have expounded at this point present an instructive contrast. Keim gives to the section commencing with the words "Come unto me," the heading, *Humility in the midst of Elevation*, and indicates the drift of the passage thus: Jesus, notwithstanding all his high claims, still looks on Himself as the equal of men,

and along with them as a subject of God. Ritschl, on the other hand, regards the twenty-seventh verse and those which follow as standing in a relation not of contrast but of sequence. In calling Himself the meek and lowly One, Jesus does not, as it were, make his humility a set-off against his lofty pretensions. On the contrary, the fact of his being the meek and lowly One is the proof that He is entitled to say, "All things are given unto me." By the epithets meek and lowly, He identifies Himself with the suffering righteous man of the Old Testament, with this difference, that the latter was not reconciled to his affliction, but complained of it, whereas Jesus was meek and lowly in *heart*, took his afflictions patiently, cheerfully, and so triumphed over them. And this very patience or meekness in heart was just the proof that He was Master of the world, that is, that all things were given unto Him. "To bear, is to conquer our fate;" and Jesus was a king and a conqueror, as none before or after, because He bore all the ills of life, the contradictions of sinners, the contemptuous unbelief of "the wise and prudent," with perfect equanimity. Such a bald interpretation has, we think, small chance of being accepted permanently as the key to the meaning of this incomparably gracious word of Christ; an interpretation which reduces that word to a pathetic assertion of the moral truth that resignation is the source of peace, that patience is the way to victory over the world and to tranquillity of mind. That truth no doubt is involved in the word of gracious invitation, but it is far enough from exhausting its meaning.

But to come back to the self-asserting word in *Verse* 27. We have considered the interpretation put thereon by two modern German theologians, and have expressed dissatisfaction with both. How then are we to understand this saying?

1. In accordance with our view as to the authentic form of the saying, we hold that Christ does not here lay claim to importance on the ground of his being the Introducer of a new spiritual religion, the Setter-forth of a new idea of God in his relation to men, the Teacher of the doctrine that God is a Father. All this He might have said of Himself in a true sense, but it is not this which He does in fact say. It is not so much what He teaches men concerning God as what God is to Himself, that is the foremost in his thoughts. What He teaches is second, not first in importance. And even when He comes to speak of what He teaches, what He means to claim for Himself is not that He, first among religious teachers, has taught men to regard God as a Father. The words, "Neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son," &c., are not to be paraphrased, "Neither knoweth any man that God is a Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal this truth." The name Father, applied to God, is not to be emphasized, as if the Speaker's chief aim were to assert that that is God's proper name: the title is used instinctively, as a matter of course, in accordance with the habit of the Speaker.

2. The text contains these two things: (1) First a declaration concerning the relation in which the Speaker stands to the God whom He habitually calls Father, and here with emphasis *my* Father; (2) an

assertion of his claim to be the exclusive Revealer of the Father, the Speaker herein appreciating Himself at his full value in presence of a world that sets no value on Him at all. As to the former, it embraces two particulars: an affirmation by Jesus that He is the object of a perfect knowledge (implying a perfect love) on the Father's part, and a further affirmation that the Father shews his love to Him as his son by treating Him with all possible honour, and conferring upon Him all a son's privileges, giving all things into his hands. It is as if the Speaker had said: "My Father is the only Being who knows me thoroughly;[1] many know me not at all; my disciples know me but partially; even the Baptist's knowledge of me is very one-sided. My Father alone knows me altogether. He is entirely acquainted with all my thoughts and ways. And in this his perfect knowledge I find rest to my weary heart in this uncongenial world. It is the pillow on which I lay my head when vexed by the blindness of unbelief, and by the misapprehension of my own followers and well-wishers. And not only does my Father know me as his son, but he treats me as a son with all due honour. All things are delivered unto me of my Father; and in this fact also I find consolation amid the disappointments of life. For this delivery of all things into my hands is the result and expression of the Father's infinite affection for me. The Father loveth me, his Son, and therefore hath given all things into my hands."

But where is the evidence of the gift expressive of infinite love? The Speaker has just admitted

[1] ἐπιγινώσκει. The ἐπι implies thoroughness.

that He has received from his Father as yet only a few babes. Whence then this vast leap from the few babes to all things? Shall we say it is the utterance of One who looks with a prescient eye into the future, and foresees the time when the kingdom, now embracing only an insignificant number of still more insignificant persons, shall be world-wide; and when the new religion, the worship of the Father in spirit and in truth, shall be universally prevalent, as it is intrinsically fit and worthy to be? We may say this with truth; but when we have said it, we have not said all. There is not only prescience of the future here, but knowledge of the past, intimate acquaintance with the Father's eternal purpose. The Speaker says, "All things were given[1] me of my Father." The words suggest the mystery of pre-existence proclaimed by the Fourth Evangelist. Does it not seem as if this strange Man had some other source of knowledge as to the Father's intentions besides that of earthly experience, so that He is under no temptation to judge of his Father's love by present appearances? Whence this unearthly serenity under the penuriousness and meanness of the Father's present gift in Providence—these few babes? Is He not enabled to bear the smallness of the apparent gift through his secret knowledge of the Father's eternal purpose to put all things into his hands, to make the destiny of all depend on the attitude they shall ultimately assume towards Himself? and does not that secret knowledge point to a being in the bosom of the Father,

[1] *παρεδόθη*, aorist. *Cf.* Luke xii. 32, "Fear not, little flock; for it pleased the Father (*εὐδόκησεν*) to give you the kingdom."

such as that whereof the Fourth Evangelist speaks when he says, "No man hath seen God at any time: the only begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him"? [1]

It may be said that this way of interpreting this Synoptic text converts it into a Johannine saying. And why not? Why should not Jesus speak as the Fourth Gospel makes Him speak, when He is placed in circumstances similar to those in which the Fourth Gospel for the most part places Him, viz., in presence of the unbelief, gainsaying, and contempt of the cultivated class of Jewish society? Such, as we now well understand, are the circumstances in which we find Jesus here placed; and, as pointed out in our first paper, it is remarkable that the Synoptical Christ, when mentally confronted with the unbelieving wise, should speak so very like the Johannine Christ. It shews that there would have been more of this sort of utterance in the Synoptical Gospels had the writers not confined themselves in their narratives mainly to the Galilean ministry, in which Jesus had much more frequently to do with simple folk, the babes, than with the men who considered themselves in knowledge and culture superior to the multitude—in Greek phrase, with the *οἱ πολλοί*, as distinguished from the *οἱ χαρίεντες*.

3. Besides asserting such an intimate transcendental relation between Himself and his Divine Father, Jesus further, as we said, claims for Himself absolute importance as the Revealer of God the Father. "Neither knoweth any one the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son shall

[1] John i. 18.

reveal him:" thus does the meek and lowly One assert his importance, not in vanity or egotism, but with the calm dignity becoming the Mediator between God and man. He claims two distinctions for Himself, perfect knowledge of God, and the privilege of being the exclusive medium through whom God becomes known to men. In advancing the former of these claims He says, in effect, "Men may despise me, but I have a secret worth possessing—the knowledge of God. This secret the wise and knowing do not possess, their very conceit of wisdom shuts out the light of this knowledge; and their spiritual blindness is evinced by their manner of treating me. For judgment am I come, so far as they are concerned, that those who see might be made blind."

But it is not the Speaker's wish to have an absolute monopoly of this knowledge. He is willing, nay anxious, to communicate it. His spirit is even now grieved because so many are indifferent to his secret. He recognizes it as his vocation to introduce men to the true knowledge of God. He regards Himself as sent into the world for this very end, and He lets his light shine so that men may know the true God, his Father, through Him the Son. Yet, while thus faithfully fulfilling his vocation as Revealer, He thinks it right, in presence of proud contemptuous unbelief, to lay stress on two things: that the knowledge of God is attainable only through Him, and that in revealing the true God He exercises his own freedom. He declines to rank Himself among the lights of the world, as one of many co-ordinate in rank, or differing only in degree,

He being possibly, by general consent, *primus inter pares*. He claims to be the light of the world, the Sun—all other illuminators being but shining lamps, deriving their light from the central luminary. He does not mean that men who through want of opportunity know not Him, the historical Christ, must on that account be without such knowledge of God as is necessary unto salvation. He could mean no such thing; and the fact that He nevertheless claims to be the sole medium through whom God is known, is only another proof that this high mystic utterance takes us out of the historical incarnate life of the Speaker into the sphere of the eternal and divine. Jesus means to claim for Himself the position towards God, and the function towards the world, of the Johannine Logos, who is the light of every man in any land or in any age who has light, and through whom every one is saved that is saved, even though he be not possessed of a knowledge of the historical Christ.

Then as to the other point, the freedom of the Son in revealing, which is markedly emphasized,[1] that is insisted on in the same spirit in which Paul said to the men of Israel in Antioch, "It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you: but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles."[2] We are not to imagine that because Jesus uses this word "will," He means that He may possibly in an arbitrary manner refuse the needful light to any one earnestly seeking it. Oh, no! Let us not mistake the severity

[1] ᾧ ἐὰν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι.

[2] Acts xiii. 46.

of Christ's tone for wilfulness or misanthropy. How far the Son of Man and the Son of God was from these vices we may see from what follows. "Come unto me." Where can we find, even among the words of Jesus, anything more humane, more tender, more gracious, more philanthropic? Jesus may be disappointed, sad, even stern; but He has not ceased to be the well-wisher of the ignorant, the sorrowful, the mentally perplexed, the guilty. He has not even grown weary in well-doing, or yielded in the smallest degree to the temptation to abandon the task of illuminating the dark world in despair. He utters the affectionate, most moving, invitation with which the Chapter closes, as if for the purpose of letting that be seen. In spite of prevailing unbelief, He proclaims aloud to the world his unabated desire to be the Friend of man in every possible way; giving light to those in spiritual darkness, rest to the weary, peace to the guilty, comfort to the afflicted.

ALEX. B. BRUCE.

THAT CHRIST SPOKE GREEK.

It has been the almost universal opinion of Biblical scholars that our Lord Jesus Christ spoke a kind of Hebrew *patois*, which is variously denominated Aramaic or Syro-Chaldaic. On that hypothesis, nearly all the words which He really uttered have been lost for ever. The few scattered expressions, like *Raca*, *Cephas*, and *Ephphatha*, to be found in the Gospels, are the only relics of the language which did, in truth, proceed out of his mouth. The whole of the Greek is a translation. We have nothing more than a few brief sentences which the Son of God positively uttered when He dwelt with men upon the earth.

The thesis which I venture to maintain on this the most interesting of all literary questions is the exact converse of that usually held. While it is generally said that Christ, for the most part, spoke in Aramaic, and only on some rare occasions in Greek, my contention is that He almost always made use of Greek in his public discourses, and only now and then, for special reasons, had recourse to the vernacular Hebrew. In this point of view, we still possess in the existing Greek Gospels—so far as the language is concerned, and so far as strict accuracy in reporting has been observed—the *ipsissima verba* which proceeded out of our Saviour's mouth.

I have said that the controversy as to the language really made use of by Christ involves the most interesting of all literary questions. And probably every one will admit this. It is related of the illustrious Christian philosopher Boyle, that towards the end of his days he sought to master Syriac, with the view of thus coming as near as possible to the actual language which it was supposed our Lord employed. I have in my own possession a letter from the late eminent Isaac Taylor, in which he states that, after considering my argument and being convinced by it, he felt, on reading the Greek Gospels, a sense of nearness to Christ which he had never possessed while these Gospels were regarded as a translation. And in one of many kind letters which the late Lord Lytton wrote to me on the subject, he says: "To my mind, our reverence for the Gospels, and even the respect with which a Deist of fine understanding would view them, are increased by all that tends to render it probable that we are not reading that paraphrase which words rendered into another language from that in which they were spoken could scarcely fail to be, but viewing the Mind that spoke in the language it employed."

It is now fifteen years since my views on the Language of Christ were presented to the world. That is truly, as Tacitus remarks, "grande mortalis ævi spatium;" but it could not reasonably be regarded as long enough to secure acceptance for views (even supposing them correct) so entirely opposed to prevailing opinions as those which I ventured to present. I am, therefore, not surprised that the old conceptions on the subject referred to still hold the ground. We

find the most recent writers on questions connected with the Gospels proceeding, without a word, on the assumption that Hebrew, in the form of Aramaic, was the language constantly employed by Christ. As I still firmly maintain the contrary, and have no doubt of the ultimate acceptance of truth on this as on all other questions, I gladly avail myself of an invitation to give an outline of my argument in the pages of THE EXPOSITOR, leaving it to any who may become interested in the question to seek a further acquaintance with all its bearings in the work to which allusion has already been made.[1]

The position which I endeavour to make good is this. I believe that the Jews of our Saviour's time were bilingual, their old ancestral tongue still surviving among them in a corrupted form, and being, for the most part, employed in familiar domestic intercourse, while the Greek existed side by side with it, and was usually made use of for all public and literary purposes. Many analogous cases will at once occur to the reader. It may be sufficient to refer to Wales, or the Highlands of Scotland, in numerous districts of which both the Celtic and English tongues are in constant use, the one being the language of homely private life, and the other being made use of as the language of literature, and on almost all public occasions.

Every one acquainted with the facts of the case will grant how wide-spread the Greek language had become before the commencement of our era. It was

[1] "Discussions on the Gospels, in two parts. Part I. On the Language employed by our Lord and his disciples. Part II. On the Original Language of St. Matthew's Gospel, and on the Origin and Authenticity of the Gospels." Macmillan and Co.

in truth the common medium of intercourse throughout the whole civilized world. Cicero, bringing out this point by contrast to his native tongue, declares in well-known words, "Græca leguntur in omnibus fere gentibus, Latina suis finibus, exiguis sane, continentur."[1] This statement, if true in the great orator's day, became far more emphatically so some generations afterwards. The knowledge and use of the Greek language continued to spread with great rapidity during the century which followed the death of Cicero, and it retained its supremacy for several ages as the language of the Christian Church. Let me refer only to the following facts. The Apostle Paul wrote to the Romans and Galatians in Greek; Latin writers both in prose and verse[2] testify to the constant use which was made of Greek in the Imperial City at the date at which they write; while towards the end of the second century Irenæus wrote from Lyons in Greek, on a theme interesting to, and intended to be considered by, the whole Christian world.

The question now is, Had Greek, in any way, attained a footing in Palestine as in the rest of the world? Answers crowd upon us to this question, and these both of an *a priori* and *a posteriori* character. It seems almost impossible for any one to consider the national history of the Jews for a century or two before Christ without concluding that Greek could not have failed to secure a large ascendency among them. The several dynasties to which they were successively subject, Egyptian, Syrian, and Roman, alike contributed to this result. A new wave

[1] *Pro Arch.* 23. [2] Suet. *Tib.* cap. 71; Juv. *Sat.* vi. 180, *et seq.* &c.

of Hellenic influence passed over the land with every fresh change which occurred in its political condition. Nor was this influence much checked under the Maccabean princes. With the temporary independence then enjoyed, there was, no doubt, an attempt made to throw off the taint of Gentilism in every particular. But Hellenic tendencies had become too firmly rooted in the land, and the constant use of the Greek language was found too necessary in all national transactions, to allow of any considerable change taking place during the brief period in which Judæa then existed as an independent kingdom. And soon did the hopeless effort die away. More than half a century before the beginning of our era Pompey the Great appeared in Palestine as an arbiter between the brothers Hyrcanus and Aristobulus, and from that moment Gentile influence revived in greater power than ever. The government speedily passed from the Asmonæan to the Herodian family; Judæa soon became an acknowledged dependency of Rome; and we naturally conclude that, as in other parts of the Empire, so in Palestine, the Roman power would be the pioneer and support of Greek civilization and literature.[1]

But now let us look at facts. We have the Apocryphal books of the Old Testament, the writings of Josephus, inscriptions still remaining on ruins in Palestine, numismatic evidence, and, above all, the New Testament itself, from all which sources proof is to be derived in favour of the conclusion for which I contend.

[1] Ewald (*Gesch. des Volk. Is.* iv. 250–520) gives an excellent sketch of the history of the period, shewing the gradual encroachments and ultimate ascendency of Gentilism.

As to the Apocryphal books, there is good reason to believe that the latest of them was written some time before the commencement of our era, while the others range, at somewhat uncertain dates, from that period up to perhaps the third century before Christ. And it at once strikes us as a suggestive fact connected with these books, that they exist only in *Greek.* One of them, we know, was at first written in Hebrew, but the original was soon replaced by a translation. Another is generally believed to have been composed in Hebrew, but of it, too, all traces of the supposed original have perished. Some of the rest are conjectured by critics to have been partly written in Greek and partly in the ancient tongue of Palestine, but of all, without exception, it holds true that only in their *Greek* form were they generally known among the Jews of our Saviour's day.

Now, in this consideration there seems to be an argument which will weigh much with every unprejudiced mind in the controversy respecting the prevailing language of Palestine at the time of Christ. The Jewish *literature* was then Greek. Writings intended for the people, and commonly current among them, were composed in the Greek language. Of that fact, the most cursory glance at the Apocrypha is sufficient to convince us; and the impression thus made is strengthened by a more particular examination of the several books.

Let me, for instance, refer to a single incident recorded in the Second Book of Maccabees. In the seventh chapter of that book we have a remarkable account of the heroic conduct of a mother and her seven sons when subjected to torture in the presence

of Antiochus Epiphanes. Mention is again and again made in the narrative of the sufferers having made use of their proper ancestral tongue in addressing each other, while, at the same time, it is evident from the intercourse which they held with the king that they also understood and employed Greek. There can be no doubt that both the mother and sons were *bilingues*, speaking between themselves in Hebrew, and addressing Antiochus in Greek. This whole book, it may be remarked, bears unmistakable evidence of the sway then possessed by Hellenic influence in Palestine. No one can read it, in a spirit of candour, without being convinced that, as the writer himself declares (Chap. iv. 13), "a kind of acme of Hellenism" had then been reached in the land; and that, in accordance with this state of things, the people generally had become quite familiar with the Greek language.

Much might be said on the point at issue in connection with the writings of Josephus. But I shall refer, at present, to only two notable passages. The first occurs in the preface to the "Wars," and may be rendered as follows: "I have devoted myself to the task of translating, for the sake of those who live under the government of the Romans, the narrative which I formerly composed in our national language, and transmitted to the barbarians of the interior." It is now generally agreed that by the "barbarians" here referred to (τοῖς ἄνω βαρβάροις) Josephus means the Jews of Babylon, Parthia, Arabia, and those beyond the Euphrates. For the information of these distant members of his nation, he had at first composed his history of the Jewish war

in Hebrew. This history, he tells us, he afterwards translated into Greek "for the sake of those living under the government of the Romans"—manifestly, therefore, though not exclusively, for the use of his brethren in Palestine. The inference as to the language dominant among them is obvious. Nor does the conclusion to be derived from the other passage in the works of Josephus referred to appear to me less decisive. It is to be found in the last chapter of his "Antiquities" (xx. 11, 2). Much erroneous reasoning has, I believe, been founded on this passage. I shall have to refer to it again, when dealing with the objections which have been brought forward against my argument. Meanwhile I remark that it implies, as Cardinal Wiseman in his *Horæ Syriacæ* has observed, that so prevalent was the knowledge of Greek then among the Jews, that the very *slaves* understood it ("Etiam servi linguam Græcam callebant"), and that thus, as Josephus states, on account of the commonness of the accomplishment, it was undervalued by those who aimed at a high reputation.

Proceeding now to a brief notice of existing inscriptions in Palestine, it is well known that almost all those which can be dated about the time of Christ are in Greek. Seetzen long ago collected sixty-nine, all of which, with one exception, were in that language. Burckhardt in his "Travels in Syria" (1823) also gives a great variety of Greek inscriptions. And coming down to our own day, I find Captain Burton in "Unexplored Syria" (ii. 378) making the following remark: "Mr. Tyrwhitt Drake and I, when travelling about the Haurán, copied some one hundred

and thirty-five Greek inscriptions, besides three Palmyrene." The inference as to the ancient linguistic condition of the country is clear and conclusive.

The numismatic evidence plainly points to the same conclusion. There is hardly an exception to the rule that the various coins which circulated in Palestine about the time of Christ bear Greek superscriptions. And it seems impossible to give any adequate explanation of this fact unless we admit, in accordance with what has already been said, that Greek was then the prevailing language of the country.

But we have now to notice by far the most important source of proof in the prosecution of this argument—that which is found in the New Testament itself. I here assume that the several books are a genuine product of the age to which they are generally referred. Of course, some will dispute that position, and to them the reasoning founded on the postulate named will have little weight. In fact, an eminent Biblical scholar said to me in as many words, after reading my work, that he would have felt the argument as to the habitual use of Greek by Christ irresistible, had he believed that the Gospels belonged to the first century of our era. It is only fair then to say that, in what follows, I proceed upon that assumption. The New Testament is regarded as having been written at the time which has been usually assigned it, and by the persons to whom its several portions are ascribed. These positions admit, I believe, of conclusive proof, but are here taken for granted. And, supposing them conceded, I have

now to ask the reader's attention to a general glance at the books of which the New Testament consists.

Turning first to the Epistles, this question at once occurs. How *could* Palestinian Jews, like Peter, James, and John—"unlettered and ignorant men," as they were styled by their countrymen—men certainly possessed of no advantages, either of rank or education, above the respectable labouring classes in Judæa—*have written in Greek*, unless that were the language which men even in the humblest station naturally employed?

The old answer to this question—that the Greek of the sacred writers was due to the gift of tongues—is now almost universally abandoned. Every Biblical scholar of reputation agrees with Neander when he says that the apostles, like other people, obtained their knowledge of the language "according to the natural laws of lingual acquirement." But then this conclusion immediately draws after it another. If Peter and James naturally made use of the Greek language, that language must have been known to all classes in the community. And this is a point which I beg to press upon the attention of those who maintain that Hebrew was then chiefly, or almost exclusively, the language of Palestine. How, I ask, in that case, were the apostles able, as they did, to write in Greek? The idea of a miracle having been wrought for this purpose being set aside, there remains no other explanation of the fact in question than that Greek was a language which they habitually employed. But then, as I maintain, this concession implies that it was in common use by the great body of the population. These first

disciples of Jesus were taken from the lower ranks among the people. They had, no doubt, previous to their call to the apostleship, received the elements of an ordinary education; and there can be no question that, during the years of their intercourse with Christ, great additions were made to their intellectual vigour and attainments. But all this will not account for their knowledge of Greek, if it be supposed that Hebrew was the language to which alone they were accustomed from their youth, and which they habitually employed in intercourse with their Divine Master. No one can doubt that they possessed a very considerable command of the Greek language — their writings are sufficient to prove that point. How then, I ask again, did they acquire it? Not by miraculous interposition, as is now generally admitted. It must therefore have been in the natural and ordinary way; and, this being granted, it follows as an irresistible inference, that if they, humble fishermen of Galilee, understood Greek to such an extent as naturally and easily to write it, that language must have been generally known and used among the people.

And now turning to the Gospels, and glancing over their contents, what reason do we find for supposing that they contain merely *translations* of the words which our Lord employed? Is there a single hint to that effect given by any of the writers? Do they not, on the contrary, express themselves exactly as they would have done supposing they had meant to report to us the very language which was made use of by the Saviour? A very strange mode of reasoning, as appears to me, has prevailed with respect

to those occasional Aramaic expressions which are inserted in the Gospels as having been employed by Christ. It has been argued that the occurrence of such terms, now and then, in the reports which have been preserved to us of our Lord's discourses, *proves* that He generally made use of the Syro-Chaldaic language; and that, accordingly, it is in these few instances only that we have examples of the very words which He employed. But such a conclusion rests upon a manifest *petitio principii:* there is not the least foundation furnished for it in the Evangelic narrative. None of the writers ever imply that they are giving the words of Jesus more exactly when they report Hebrew than when they report Greek. On the contrary, the very same mode of expression is made use of by them, whether it be the one language or the other which our Lord is represented as employing; and to say, therefore, that the occurrence here and there of an Aramaic word or phrase proves that He habitually made use of that dialect, is simply to *assume* the point in question, and to mistake for a sound and valid argument what is in reality a foregone conclusion.

The fact seems to be, that the occasional occurrence of Aramaic expressions in the Gospels, instead of proving that Christ habitually made use of that dialect, rather tends to prove the contrary. If it be maintained that Syro-Chaldaic was the language which He generally employed, the question at once occurs, why we have a few such words, and a few only, preserved to us as having been used by Him on rare occasions. On the supposition that He spoke usually in Greek, these words, we may see, come in

naturally enough as exceptions to the general rule, just as in the reported discussions of Cicero we often find a few Greek terms introduced; and, as in our own language, a French or German expression may every now and then occur. But if, on the other hand, it be supposed that Christ really, for the most part, made use of the Aramaic, so that the Greek was the exception, and not the rule, in his discourses, it seems impossible, as experience has shewn, to give any satisfactory, or even tolerable, explanation of the manner in which the few Aramaic words found in the Gospels are introduced.

It may, however, in turn be asked, Can any reason be assigned for the occurrence of these expressions on the hypothesis that our Lord spoke, for the most part, in Greek, and only now and then in Hebrew? The reply to this question has already been suggested. Let it be remembered that I admit and maintain the simultaneous existence in Palestine, at the date referred to, of both the Aramaic and Greek, the former language being, no doubt, in many respects subordinate to the latter, but still the mother-tongue of most of the native population; and how natural the supposition that, in such circumstances, our Lord should have sometimes found it proper or expedient to depart from his usual practice, and make use of the debased but still vernacular language of the country.

Let me refer, in illustration, to Mark v. 41, which in English runs thus: "He took the damsel by the hand, and said unto her, *Talitha cumi;* which is, being interpreted, Damsel, I say unto thee, arise." Now, on the supposition that Greek was our Lord's

usual form of address, I cannot but think that a very good and satisfactory ground may be perceived for the exception which is here particularly noted. The person on whom this miracle was performed was of tender years, and was probably as yet but little acquainted with Greek. At any rate, Greek was to her, as to every native Jew, a language not generally employed in the domestic circle, and it was to Hebrew that her ears from infancy had been accustomed. How beautifully accordant, then, with the character of Him whose heart was tenderness itself, that now, as He bent over the lifeless frame of the maiden, and breathed that life-giving whisper into her ear, it should have been in the loved and familiar accents of her mother-tongue. Although dead and insensible the moment before the words were uttered, yet, ere the sound of them passed away, there was life and sensibility within her. Does not every reader thereby perceive, in the thoughtful tenderness of the act, a most sufficient reason why it was in Hebrew, and not in Greek, that our Lord now addressed her? And do we not also discover a cause why the fact of his having done so should be specially noticed by the Evangelist? Are we not thus furnished with a new and affecting example of our Saviour's graciousness? And do we not feel that St. Mark—the most minutely descriptive of all the Evangelists—deserves our gratitude for having preserved it? Softly and sweetly must the tones of that loving voice, speaking in the language of her childhood, have fallen on the sleeping spirit of the maiden; and by words of tenderness, no less than words of power, was she thus recalled to life and happiness.

In regard to this whole matter, it is obvious that, on the supposition of our Lord having spoken, for the most part, in Greek, we can very easily account for those isolated and occasional Hebrew terms which occur in his discourses. The Aramaic had, as a matter of course, no small influence upon the Greek of the country, and necessarily insinuated many of its idioms and expressions into the co-existing language. Hence the occurrence of such words as *Amen*, *Corban*, *Rabbi*, &c.; of such designations as *Cephas*, *Boanerges*, &c.; and of such phrases as *πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν*, *γεύεσθαι θανάτου*, &c. But it seems no easy matter, on the hypothesis that our Lord generally made use of Hebrew, to account for the retaining of such words as *Ῥακά* (Matt. v. 22) and *Μαμμωνᾷ* (Luke xvi. 11), while his language is, for the most part, translated. For why, it may well be asked, should an exception be made in favour of these expressions? What right had *they* to stand as they were originally uttered, while the whole context in which they are imbedded was subjected to a process of translation? It certainly does appear to me somewhat difficult to answer these questions on the supposition that our Lord generally made use of Hebrew; whereas, on the theory which I uphold, that the substance of his discourse was Greek, and has thus been reported to us in its original form by the Evangelists, nothing could be more natural, or indeed inevitable, than that such Aramaic words and phrases should from time to time occur and be preserved.

I shall enter upon an examination of special passages afterwards, but meanwhile I venture to main-

tain that, as has been shewn, there is every reason to conclude, from a general survey of the New Testament, that Greek was generally known and used in Palestine at the time of Christ; that *that* accordingly was the language which He usually employed; and that, while He sometimes made use in public of the Aramaic dialect, such an occurrence was quite exceptional to his ordinary practice, and is on that account distinguished by particular notice in the Evangelic history. A. ROBERTS.

THE GOSPEL IN THE EPISTLES.

I believe that Jesus Christ suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried; that he descended into hell, and the third day rose again from the dead.

WHEN we begin to institute a comparison between the Gospels and Epistles on the above-quoted articles, we are struck at once with the different way in which the meaning of these sublime events of the Saviour's life was understood before and after the gift of the Holy Ghost. The Evangelists make conspicuous everywhere how little even the chosen Twelve understood concerning the events which were to befall their Master. When Jesus (Luke xviii. 31–34) said plainly to them that, in their approaching visit to Jerusalem, He should be delivered to the Gentiles, be mocked, scourged, and put to death, and the third day should rise again; we are told, "They understood none of these things, and this saying was hid from them, neither knew they the things which were spoken." And if this were so with the plain details of what was about to come to

pass before their eyes, how much less were they likely to understand the great purpose for which these events were permitted to occur! Christ, as we shall presently see, had given to his disciples, before the Resurrection, some few intimations of the great end for which He had come into the world; and when the Holy Ghost came upon them, these things were, without doubt, brought vividly to their remembrance, and the full meaning then made plain to them of what before had been obscure, or rather incomprehensible.

But in the Epistles the historic details of Christ's passion form a very trifling portion of the Apostle's matter. He deals almost wholly with the end for which these events were wrought. It is not that Christ died, but that He died for the sins of men, which St. Paul is anxious to proclaim: it is not the resurrection of Jesus only which he preaches, but that Christ is the first-fruits of them that sleep, and that we too shall be raised, yea, all in Christ shall be made alive: it is not a mere historic fact that Jesus was taken up into heaven, and that a cloud received Him out of the sight of the disciples, of which St. Paul has to tell, but that the followers of Christ should seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God.

Of all this teaching the Gospels which have been preserved for us say but very little. Till Christ's resurrection was accomplished, and the fact thereof fully received, no such lessons could have place; of which lessons, however, the Epistles are full, and the narrative which we derive from the Gospels can only be traced by allusions made here and there by

St. Paul, and is to be gathered perhaps rather by inferences than from direct statements. Yet this feature in the character of our Gospels, that they are wanting in all teaching about the doctrines connected with Christ's death and resurrection, and only give us the very baldest statements of facts, is of the utmost importance. It shews us that we have in the narratives of the Evangelists a truthful record of these great events, and that no attempt has been made by them to alter the story from its most primitive form. We know that the Gospels were all written many years after the publication of some of the Epistles, a long time after the full significance of Christ's death had been proclaimed through the known world. But at first, when the apostles began to preach, they must have narrated in its simplest form the mere story of the life of Jesus, as it had presented itself to each of them. Wherever they founded a new Church, this would be their opening teaching, and the Churches founded by St. John, St. Peter, or St. Matthew, would have each heard, over and over, from the lips of these apostles, the simple story of their three years' life with Christ, and of all He taught, and of all their astonishment, and how, at the last, they were still without understanding, till the Holy Ghost came upon them. These early histories would be held precious by the converts, and would be widely remembered, and parts of them, no doubt, reduced to a permanent form by those who heard them. But before our present Gospels were put forth, Christian teaching, founded on these simple histories of Jesus, had developed and become the life of scores of congre-

gations. Yet without any attempts at digression, without the slightest endeavour to wed the spiritual teaching, which was so well known when they were put forth, to the recital of Christ's life-history, without any wish to supply the deficiency of comprehension on the part of the disciples, the compiler of each Gospel has given his life of Christ in its plainest and earliest form. As we read, we can fancy the apostles themselves relating their story, just as, at the first, they set before their hearers that of which they had been eye-witnesses and ministers, and told how at the time they had failed to see the object of that life on which they had attended. Set forth with all their variations and in all their plainness, the Gospels bear thus a most powerful testimony to their own truthful character. Written at a time when the whole teaching of Christ's life could have been expounded, they are content to say that the disciples at Christ's death did not know what his life had meant; written at a time when it would have been easy to produce more complete and connected histories, the reverence which these writers had for the very words of the apostolic narrators has been shewn most convincingly; for they have faithfully recorded for us what can only have been the very earliest form of Christ's history, and have confined themselves strictly to an account of "what Jesus *began* to do and to teach," given as four of the apostles had published it from the first. Such a simplicity carries us back, for the date of our Gospel story, as far as the time of St. Peter's first sermon.

With the phenomena of the Gospels, which contain a simple repetition of the teachings of Jesus as they

were remembered by those who heard them, and the Epistles, written before the Gospels, and exhibiting developments and applications of the Gospel teaching, we may compare the two forms in which has been preserved for us the account of the teaching of Socrates. Xenophon and Plato were both pupils of that philosopher. The former devoted the early part of his life, after the termination of his studies, to the profession of a soldier, with the glories of which his name will be for ever remembered. The latter carried on the teaching of his master, and is looked upon as his direct successor. Plato's dialectic method is a development of what he had learnt from Socrates, but tinged in many places with his own cast of mind, which we cannot but see was much more poetical than that of his master. Socrates was put to death B.C. 399, and Plato's teaching, of which we possess the matured results, was continued till B. C. 347. From his writings we can gather an account of Socrates, but it is rather the philosophic than the historic Socrates which we find there. The man is in the background, and the prominent place is given to his teachings. On the contrary, in the *Memorabilia* of Xenophon we have recorded in the blunt and unadorned way which we should expect from a soldier the simple discourses, dialogues, and actions of the man Socrates, whom his pupil undertook to defend from the aspersions which, after his death, were cast by his enemies upon his memory, which he does by a plain account of such things as Socrates did and taught. Xenophon lived nearly as long as Plato, dying about B.C. 354, but he was not, after [illegible], mixed up with Athenian life or the events

connected with Socrates or his teaching. The course of Xenophon's life makes it almost certain that it was not till long after the death of his master that he undertook to put together and give to the world the discourses which by memory or in notes he had preserved since the days when they fell from the lips of Socrates; for he went away with the famous expedition of Cyrus, and seems to have been in Asia at the time when his master was put to death. He continued there, and engaged in other warlike labours till after B.C. 394, when he fought against his own countrymen at the battle of Coronea. He was banished from Athens, and so was not in the way of hearing directly all that was said there concerning Socrates; and it is believed, although his sentence of banishment was revoked, that he never returned to his native city. So that we have from him, without any attempt at development, a genuine picture of Socrates and his philosophy, the existence of which, side by side with the more elaborated works of his fellow-pupil, shews us that there is no improbability in the supposition that earnest listeners to the first teachings of Jesus, or to the narratives which the apostles gave of such teachings, would be able to put down and would desire to preserve a very faithful record of the precise language in which the Gospel story was first told, although there existed letters, like those of St. Paul, which contained the working out of the simple principles of the Gospel and the application of these principles in the development of Christian societies.

In the Epistles we find the doctrinal lessons which the Church is meant to learn from the life of Jesus,

and of these very little is said in the Gospels; but that we may see how true the teaching of the Epistles is to the tone which pervades the histories, it may be well to point out a few of the most noteworthy passages in which Christ made known some of the great purposes of his manifestation in the flesh. In general terms He proclaimed (Matt. xviii. 11) that his mission was "to save that which was lost." Then (Mark x. 45) connecting this work of salvation more directly with his death, He says that He came "to give his life a ransom for many." In the Fourth Gospel (Chap. iii. 14) we find Him teaching, though in language which could hardly be fully comprehended till after his Passion: "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life." And again, under the likeness of the good Shepherd, Jesus had spoken (John x. 15) of Himself, and said, "I lay down my life for the sheep;" and soon afterwards, "I lay down my life that I might take it again." It could only be after the resurrection had given the key to words like these that the disciples would see their full drift, any more than of that subsequent saying (John xii. 32), "I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me." Much light was shed on all these words during the converse of the forty days, wherein we are told (Luke xxiv. 45), "He opened their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures, and said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among

all nations." When, therefore, we read in the Epistles (as Rom. iii. 24) that men are justified freely by God's grace "through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus;" or (2 Cor. v. 15) that Christ "died for all, that they who live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him who died for them, and rose again;" or (Gal. iii. 13), "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us;" and presently afterwards (Chap. iii. 22) of "the promise by faith of Jesus Christ, given to them that believe," we feel that we have before us only the natural offgrowth of the less distinct teachings in the Gospels, and that these first lessons given in the Gospels were not of themselves vague and uncertain, but needed only that the resurrection of Christ should be accomplished, and then their language would receive its due significance.

But although there is of necessity this advance in the teaching which the Epistles give us concerning the purpose of Christ's sacrifice, there is yet no difficulty in shewing that it was the simple narrative of the Gospels which formed the basis on which all the rest of the teaching was founded. Christ's agony in the garden, and the struggle of his humanity, followed by his self-surrender to do the will of the Father, must have been told as we know it before the Apostle could write of Jesus Christ (Gal. i. 4), that He "*gave himself* for our sins." We have already noticed how certainly the Corinthians must have heard the Gospel narrative of the betrayal before such a short sentence as "The Lord Jesus in the same night in which he was betrayed took bread" could have been intelligible in the position in which St. Paul

introduces it. But the readers of St. Paul's letters were also fully aware that the proceedings by which Christ was doomed to death were of a judicial character. The Apostle (Rom. iv. 25) says, "He was *delivered* (παρεδόθη) for our offences." The verb here used is the strictly forensic term for bringing a person to a legal trial or handing him over to be punished after a trial. It is employed in the Gospels (Matt. xxvii. 2; Mark xv. i.) of the *delivery* of Jesus into the hands of Pilate; and again (Luke xxiii. 25; John xix. 16), of the *re-delivery* of Jesus by the Roman governor to the will of the Jews; and in speaking of his coming sufferings (Mark x. 33), Christ had used the same word of Himself: "The Son of man shall be *delivered* unto the chief priests and unto the scribes." The word had become familiar to the ears of the Roman Christians in the earliest Gospel story, and St. Paul's employment of it shews that the whole context of the Gospel where it is used was presumed to be well known, and that no explanation was needed concerning the nature of this *delivery* to which Christ was subjected.

There is another incidental expression (1 Cor. ii. 6–8) which gives evidence of the same kind, shewing how completely it was known that Christ's death had been brought about by authority. The Apostle is speaking of his own preaching, which he designates "the wisdom of God in a mystery; which," he continues, "none of the princes of this world knew: for had they known it they would not have sacrificed the Lord of glory." The Apostle no doubt embraces in the term "princes of this world" both the Jewish rulers and the Roman authorities, and implies by this

expression that the former had so far fallen from their high calling that they could only be classed with those heathen powers whose aid they had invoked to carry out their sentence. But before it was possible for St. Paul to have used such a phrase, we can see that the whole history must have been understood by the Corinthians. In no sense could the Jewish authorities be spoken of by themselves as princes of this world, but when their solicitation of the Roman authority to aid in putting Christ to death was known, then the whole array of Jewish and Roman power might well be styled by this designation.

And truly the use of the word *cross* with regard to Christ's execution implies of itself that all this explanation of the crucifixion history had been made known in all the Churches. For Jesus was a Jew, and had been accused by his countrymen of impiety. But for that offence the penalty by the Jewish law was stoning, and although the power of life and death had been taken out of the hands of the Jewish authorities, we see from the case of Stephen that a sudden outburst of popular rage might culminate in the infliction of this kind of death. But crucifixion was a Roman punishment, and cannot have been inflicted for the charge of impiety, for to that a Roman governor would have paid no heed. Every time, then, when St. Paul speaks of the manner of Christ's death, he shews us that all the story of those means whereby Roman law had been called into action to gratify Jewish rage was completely known to those for whom he wrote — how to the charge of impiety had been added that of conspiracy against the Roman

rule, and how Pilate had been constrained to give up Christ to crucifixion by the cry, "If thou let this man go, thou art not Cæsar's friend."

We can see from many passages in the Epistles how the events of Christ's Passion had become summarized, and were quoted in that brief manner which indicates a thorough acquaintance with the whole subject on the part of those who are addressed. Thus (Rom. viii. 34) St. Paul, in the close of that wondrous Chapter on the ground and assurance of the Christian's hope, asks, "Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us"—a passage wherein we have a notice of the Passion of Christ and its results, given with all the brevity of a creed. Almost in a similar manner are the same events condensed in a later Chapter (Rom. xiv. 9), "To this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living." But the most remarkable passage of this character is the Apostle's statement of the evidence of Christ's resurrection before he proceeds (1 Cor. xv. 3–7) to deduce therefrom the certainty of the resurrection of all men. "I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received." In these opening words we have another testimony that the simple facts of Gospel history formed the first lessons for converts. But he continues: "How that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures: and that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve: after that, he was seen of above

five hundred brethren at once; of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep. After that, he was seen of James; then of all the apostles." Here we have an epitome of the whole of the concluding history of Christ's life on earth, and it is given in such wise as to prove that no circumstance had been left untold by the teachers who first imparted it: the burial, the three days lying in the grave, the resurrection, and the numerous appearances just touched upon, but no more, exactly as such matters can be alluded to in addressing those, and those only, to whom a whole history is perfectly familiar.

There is another passage where a note of the time at which Christ's death took place is preserved in this same undesigned manner, which shews that the whole history had pervaded the thoughts and language of the Christian community. "Christ our *passover* is sacrificed for us," writes the Apostle to the Corinthians (1 Cor. v. 7). Only to those who had been made fully aware that it was at the great feast of the Jews that Christ's betrayal and crucifixion took place, could words like these come with their full meaning. And can we for a moment fancy that this had been told them, and that they were not likewise told how the circumstances of the Lord's death corresponded to those under which the passover lamb was offered?—that the injunction that no bone of that victim was to be broken had been marvellously kept when Jesus was slain? How otherwise could Christ be thus briefly spoken of as "our passover"? Must they not have heard, too, how from the first it had been pointed out by the Baptist, that to be thus

offered was the end for which Christ came down from heaven; that He was, as John had declared, "the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world."

Concerning the descent into hell there can of course be no direct mention in the Gospels. That the soul of Christ remained three days in the region assigned to the spirits of the dead, is to be inferred from the fact that his body was buried for that space, and his soul separated from it, as the souls of all men are after death. But whatever communication was made to the apostolic band concerning the state in which the soul of Jesus existed for those three days could only be among the things expounded in the forty days after the Resurrection. Yet it may well be that Christ intended to declare in a parable something concerning this, his brief sojourn in the unseen world, when He says (John xvi. 16), "A little while and ye see me not, and again a little while and ye shall see me." No doubt the last clause of this sentence received its first fulfilment on the morning of the Resurrection, and therefore the former part must in that view refer to Christ's abode in the world of spirits. And though by the gift of the Holy Ghost the spiritual presence of Christ with all believers fulfils the statement of the Lord in another sense through all time, yet in the sentence as at first spoken there may perhaps be gathered an intimation which, under the Spirit's illumination, might afterwards be known to be a foretelling of the descent of Christ's soul into the abyss. That in the early teachings of the apostles such a sojourn was spoken of and understood, we may see from the way in which

St. Paul writes to the Romans (Chap. x. 7), "Who shall descend into the deep? (*εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον*) that is, to bring up Christ again from the dead." In the word "abyss," here employed, we have the term which corresponds to "hades," the unseen world, the abode of the dead, which is so often translated by the "hell" of our creeds. But though we can see that the apostles had been taught, and had taught their hearers, concerning the state of Christ's spirit as it existed in the separation caused by death, yet it was not deemed necessary to make this an article of any orthodox creed till nearly four centuries after Christ. No doubt from such a doctrine the Christian believer drew much comfort, for it spake to him of Christ made, in all things but sin, like unto mankind; descending into the world of disembodied spirits, and abiding there, and yet by his return giving proof that as He has been raised so they may hope to rise. But the history of its introduction into a creed is interesting, for it seems to have been put forward first of all by the opponents of the Divinity of Jesus. The Arians first inserted this article in the confession which, in A.D. 359, they presented to the Council of Ariminum. Their words were, "He went down into the lower world" (*εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια κατελθόντα*). Now they most probably dwelt on this special feature wherein Christ shared the portion of all humanity as being helpful to their views; but the orthodox Christians thereupon included the like words in their confessions, and they are to be found in the creed published by Rufinus, A.D. 390.[1] Thus they claimed this as a true teach-

[1] See "Lumby on the Creeds," pp. 62, 184.

ing from the earliest times, but not one which told only of the humanity of Jesus, but which spake most hopefully to all men of their own future resurrection. On the fact of the Resurrection each of the Gospels gives us abundant testimony, and the verity thereof is asserted in the teaching of the Epistles over and over again. But here also we can see that all the teaching flowing from the Resurrection history is only a strict development of what the Gospels had set forth in brief, yet unmistakable, characters. These teachings of the Epistles may be summed up under two heads. First, that because Christ is risen we too shall be raised; or, as St. Paul has expressed it (1 Cor. vi. 14), "God hath both raised up the Lord, and will also raise us up by his own power;" or again (1 Cor. xv. 20), "Christ is risen from the dead, and become the firstfruits of them that slept;" or still more closely connecting our resurrection with the power of Christ (2 Cor. iv. 14), "He which raised up the Lord Jesus, shall raise up us also by Jesus." But these same lessons had been given by Christ in the Gospel, though as the Resurrection was then to come, the allusions to that event are less clear. Yet all that comforting speech of Christ with his disciples on the hope of heaven (John xiv. 2–6), is in exact harmony with the words of St. Paul. Jesus says, "In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also." Is not this Jesus becoming the firstfruits from the

dead? But He continues in language which tells us, as clearly as St. Paul's, that it is by his power that our rising again will be achieved. "I," He says, in answer to the doubtful question of St. Thomas, "am the way, the truth, and the *life*." I go before you, both into the unseen world, and after that into heaven; my words cannot fail, and my power, whereby I have first overcome death in my own person, shall prevail to give you a like victory. I am your life. Or, as He had before said to Martha (John xi. 25), "I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die."

And this brings out for us the second point of the accord between the Gospels and the Epistles on this solemn subject. It was a belief in the resurrection of Jesus which was especially demanded of Christian converts. On this point to accumulate testimony is needless. In Romans x. 9 St. Paul writes, as a description of all his own preaching, the very word of faith: "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." In full accord with such teaching as this is the lesson of our Lord's interview with Thomas (John xx. 26–29). Of the truth of the Resurrection this Apostle doubted, but when he had seen that Jesus truly was alive again, his confession of the Divinity of his Master was most full. "My Lord and my God," is his earnest exclamation. Then follows the teaching of Jesus, which is the counterpart of that

which St. Paul had put forth long before the Gospel of St. John appeared. "Thomas, because thou hast seen me thou hast believed: blessed are they who have not seen, and yet have believed." For they shall reap the blessing which the Apostle describes, by this belief they shall be saved.

But there is another aspect of the Resurrection which deserves very great notice. I mean when it is viewed as the great miracle of the life of Christ, the miracle of miracles. And in the consideration thereof we cannot but be led to observe how in the Epistles it is almost the only miracle of which any mention is made. At the same time we shall be constrained to examine into the sort of importance which the first preachers of Christianity attached to the miraculous portion of our Lord's history, and to the powers which by the Holy Spirit were bestowed upon some of themselves. We cannot, however, include so important an inquiry in the present article, but must rest content with having shewn that, in the Gospels, we have the history of Christ in its very earliest form, without comments or elucidations, exactly as it was heard from the lips of the apostles: that in these histories we can therefore expect little of the doctrinal teaching which circles round the death and resurrection of Jesus, and is so largely dwelt on in the Epistles; but yet that here too the developments of the Epistles have their basis in the Gospels, and that the chief facts of the history may be clearly inferred from the allusions which St. Paul supplies, while that Apostle himself is a witness that the early Gospel history, in its simplicity, formed the first lessons which he alike, with all other converts,

heard from the lips of the apostles and their companions. Thus he himself testifies that in the Epistles we may trace out the Gospel story, and that in his Letters he has no new teaching to give, but is only delivering that which he had received from others. J. RAWSON LUMBY.

IV.

THE LIMITS OF PRAYER.

THE leading modern objection to Prayer is based, as we have seen, on two assumptions, neither of which has been nor can be proved. The first assumption is that our lives must be ruled by laws which are invariable in their action and to which no exceptions can be allowed, or by a blind unintelligent Caprice on the action of which no man can securely calculate; that, in fact, we are shut up to this sole alternative, Law or Caprice. The answer to this assumption we found to be that, as there is much in *human* action and motive which is neither a mere observance of law nor a mere indulgence of caprice, so we may well believe that there is much in God which cannot be classed under either of these terms. A judge departs at times from the letter, and even from the clear intention of the law, not that he may follow the impulses of caprice, but that he may render a more exact justice. At times, when there is occasion and need, a master deviates from the rules he has laid down for the conduct of his business; but he may deviate from them only to shew a more considerate kindness for those whom he employs, or even to secure the very ends for which the rules were made. At times, too,

a father goes beyond the lines of the domestic order to which he commonly adheres, not from caprice, but simply that his love for his children may have free scope. Why, then, unless equity, kindness, love, be impossible to God, are we to conclude that the heavenly Father, Master, Judge, must be actuated by an irrational caprice if He should at any time, and whatever the need, transcend the laws by which He commonly abides?

The second assumption is, that if the world be ruled by law, and not by caprice, then there is no room for prayer; the law must take its course despite our supplications. And the answer to this assumption we found to be that the uniform operation of law, so far from proving the vanity of prayer, is the very ground on which we do and ought to pray. It is the very constancy and uniformity of the administration of justice, for example, which induces us to take our suits for redress before the judges. It is the very observance of law, order, rule, method, on the part of a master or a father, which encourages his children or workmen to make their requests known to him, and teaches them what sort of requests he will be likely to grant and what to refuse. In all our social relations, indeed, it is the men who walk by principle, the men who are wise, just, orderly, honourable, to whom we look for help and carry our prayers; while, on the other hand, it is the men who are capricious, uncertain, moved by every wind that blows, whom we cannot trust, and of whom we dislike to ask help, because we never know but that they will refuse it harshly and unreasonably. So far from being a fatal impediment to prayer, therefore, unifor-

mity of action, adherence to law, is an incentive to prayer—at least to the prayer which is reasonable and wise.

But prayer, if it is to be answered, if even we are to desire that it should be answered, *must* be reasonable and wise; that is, it must accord with the will—with the equity, the kindness, the love—of God. The settled purpose of a good judge is to administer justice, to see that right is done; and if the suit we bring before him accord with that purpose, we may be sure that he will decide it in our favour, either by some equitable application of the law or by equitably transcending the law. The constant purpose of a good father is to promote the welfare of his children; and if our request accord with that purpose, we may be sure that he will grant it, either by adhering to the household rules or by so modifying and relaxing them as to meet our need: but if we are simply seeking a gratification or an indulgence, which will be inimical whether to our own or to the general welfare, we may be very sure that he will not grant our request, and ought to be very thankful that he will not. In short, that uniformity of action, that very constancy of purpose, which is the life of true or reasonable prayer, is the death of selfish and unreasonable prayer.

So that after all the great question we have to ask and to answer, if we would pray aright, is: What is the will, what the purpose, of God? What is He aiming at for us, and for the universe at large? What is the end which He has set before Him, and which He will very certainly reach, whether by adhering to law or by transcending it?

And the Christian answer to this great question is most gracious and reassuring. The Everlasting Word, by whom all things were made and by whom all things subsist, came forth from the bosom of the Father to incarnate and teach the will of God; to shew us what it is like; to persuade and convince us that it is as good, as righteous and kind, as He affirmed it to be. According to Him, the will of God is our salvation—not simply nor mainly our deliverance from present or even from future punishment, but our deliverance from the evil from which all our miseries spring; a redemption which begins to take effect upon us the very moment we accept Christ's revelation of the good will of God, and which grows ever more perfect as we more fully commit ourselves to that Divine disclosure. According to Him, the infinite and eternal will of God is set on our welfare, is ever seeking it, and is satisfied only as that welfare is secured. According to Him, God is love, and love inspired by an infallible wisdom, and love using all the resources of omnipotence for our good. So that, if we may trust Christ, *the unchangeableness of God is an unchangeable Charity;* and the invariable purpose and law of his action is a loving intention and endeavour to redeem us from all the miseries of evil into all the blessedness of a sovereign and perfect goodness.

Now, as we have seen, all constancy of purpose, all uniformity of law and action, warrants expectation and hope, if only we are in harmony with it. The farmer reckons on his harvest precisely because the laws of Nature are uniform, and he is working with them, not against them. The suitor looks confi-

dently for a favourable verdict only when the administration of justice is uniform, not capricious, and he is persuaded that his claim is just. The child calculates on receiving what he asks only when the father is ruled by reason and kindness, and he knows that his request is a reasonable one, and falls in with his father's purposes and methods and aims. But *God's* aim, God's *will*, is our welfare, our true and highest welfare; and hence we may be sure that *the limits of our welfare are the only limits of his will concerning us;* the only limits, therefore, within which our prayers must be confined. And who wants to go beyond *those* limits? Who really desires God to give him what it would injure him to have? Whatever consists with the ends of love, we may ask with confidence, for God is love: and who would ask what Love must deny? Assuredly not the man who prays; for he of all men longs for welfare—his own welfare and that of the world—and desires in all things to submit his will to the larger wiser will of God.

But here it may naturally be asked: If God's will be our welfare, must not his will take effect upon us whether we do or do not pray that it may take effect? Must we *ask* Him to do his will before He will do it? And if we must, *why* must we?

The reason is plain. If we were machines, lay figures, automata, as we could not pray, so also there would be no need that we should pray: all that was requisite for us and all the good ends of which we were capable might be secured by the administration of forces and laws we could not resist. But we are *men*, men with wills of our own, wills which are our

own that we may make them God's. True, He is ever seeking our welfare; but even our welfare, since it depends on our voluntary and steadfast pursuit of righteousness, cannot be secured apart from ourselves, apart from our own actions and determinations. Our welfare depends on the character we form; and character must be freely formed: the nobler and more complete the character, the larger must be the scope of its freedom. In moral and theological discussions we too often speak of ourselves as if no free and reasonable spirit had been breathed into us; but the moment we reflect we see that as God has chosen to surround Himself with children possessed of intelligence, will, affection, even He cannot *make* us good, and so secure our welfare, by mere mechanical pressure, or even by a moral pressure which should force our wills. Were He to compel us to goodness, the goodness, such as it was, would be his, not ours. If we, we ourselves, are to be good, it can only be as we voluntarily make his will our will, and his aim for us our aim for ourselves. You can't make a child wise by performing a surgical operation on him and inserting a book into his brain; nor can you make him good by *compelling* him to do what you hold to be right. You try to make him wise by teaching him, by inducing him to learn, what you know; you try to make him good, *i.e.*, to train him for a free and manly goodness, by bringing good influences persuasively to bear on him, by trusting him, by throwing him gradually on his own resources, by your grief and displeasure when he does ill, by your approval and joy when he does well. And thus God acts, and must

act, with us now that He has made us what we are. If He were to lay his finger on our wills, and to compel us to do right, *that* would not be to make us good, nor would it be, in the highest sense, to shew Himself good. He can only make us good by winning us of our own will to do that which is right, to form the character which He approves, and to work together with Him for our own welfare and blessedness. And, therefore, He shews us what his will is, shews us how He loves us, shews us that, in his unchangeable love, He is ever seeking our welfare, and invites and persuades us to join with Him in seeking it. He unveils the beauties of holiness to us, and the miseries and degradations of sin; and when we endeavour to cease from doing evil and to follow after goodness, He offers us his help; He bids us tell Him freely of our failures and lapses and of the difficulties we encounter in our endeavours after righteousness, and assures that, if we seek them, we shall receive the succours of his grace.

Now when, through the life and teaching of Christ, we know the will of God to be our welfare and the welfare of all men; when we are assured that He is ever seeking to secure it, that nothing can divert Him from this gracious aim and endeavour: what is the natural effect of this conviction on our minds? The natural and reasonable effect of it is to persuade us that whatever we ask which will contribute either to our own good or that of the world, He will grant. We feel that we may ask Him to do us good or do our neighbours good with as confident an expectation, as reasonable a hope, as that with which the farmer, relying on the constancy of Nature, sows

his seed; or that of the suitor who, relying on the equal administration of law, takes a just claim into a court of justice; or that of a child who, relying on the constancy of paternal love, makes a request which he knows to be in accordance with his father's purpose concerning him. We know that what we ask accords with the will of God, and therefore we are sure that He will listen to our prayer.

But we could not be sure if we did not pray; for God's will is our welfare: and whether or not this or that gift will contribute to our welfare may wholly depend on whether we do or do not pray for it. Prayer is not the mere utterance of any form of words, however "noble and incomparable;" it is the kindled emotions and desires of the soul reaching out after its own true welfare or the welfare of others: that is to say, it is the longing and aspiration of the soul after that which God is ever seeking to secure for it. And when this longing is once kindled, or kindled to new activity, much may be given to us which must otherwise have been withheld.

A sick man, for example, pining under the wasting pressure of disease, asks that he may be recovered to health. But if he desire health only that he may go on living to himself, for his own selfish or base ends, it may be more for his ultimate and enduring welfare, or more for the welfare of the world around him, that his request should be denied. His prayer is not true prayer at all; for all true prayer is based on a desire that the good will of God may be done: and therefore he may ask in vain. But, on the other hand, if his thoughts upon his bed have convinced him of the folly and baseness of his previous

course of life, and he desires health mainly that he may devote himself to the pursuit of righteousness and lead a new and higher life, then it may be for his welfare, or for the welfare of the world around him, that health should be restored to him. His prayer is now true prayer; for now it has respect to the will of God, which is ever bent on the moral culture and welfare of men: and therefore it may be well that his petition should be granted.

So, again, with that "prayer for fair weather" which has, naturally enough, since it has often been terribly abused, excited no little ridicule and contempt. If, at the prompting of public authority, a nation merely recites an appointed form of words in which fair weather is asked for, without rousing itself to any moral emotion or intention, it might as well mutter a charm or an incantation. Up to this point there has been no pretence of prayer even; for prayer is the utterance of religious emotion, and as yet no religious emotion has been generated. And there may be much more than this before true prayer is reached. A nation may be moved to genuine emotion and desire; a long succession of adverse years may have brought it to the verge of famine and bankruptcy: the whole nation may long with one heart for relief, and, despairing of earthly succour, may cry to Heaven with one voice for help. But if their prayer have no respect to the will of God, to his purpose and intention for them and for all men; if they are not resolving that, should bounteous harvests and prosperous days return, they will use God's gifts in his service, *i.e.*, for good and noble ends; if they are only longing for relief, for the power to

gratify their selfish appetencies and baser desires, their prayer, however sincere, is not true prayer: it may be for their welfare that God should refuse it, that He should compel them, by the pressure of a growing misery, to reflect on the true ends and aims of human life. But if, under this pressure, a nation should lie all broken down under a sense of its sins; if it should ask succour of God with an earnest and settled intention of rising to a higher form of life, should life be spared, and of using for worthy ends whatever gifts it may please Him to bestow—then surely their prayer has become a true prayer, and it may be both for their good and for the good of the world at large that it should be answered.[1] The fair weather, the abundant harvest, the bright prosperous days may be good for them now, though before they would not have been good.

So that the spiritual emotions and intentions which find expression in all true prayer may, even in the eye of reason, affect the action of God and the course of events; they may fit us to receive, and therefore they may enable Him to bestow, gifts which, apart from these emotions and intentions, would not subserve the welfare of the world. Our main care, therefore, when we take our requests before God, should be to assure ourselves that the ends we have in view are in accordance with his Will. We should redouble our care when we ask for temporal gifts—for health, wealth, success, prosperity and the like—since in seeking *these* gifts we run a greater hazard of seeking them for selfish or unworthy ends, than when we crave moral or spiritual gifts. God's will

[1] See 2 Chron. vi. 26, 27.

is our welfare in subordination to, and as part of, the welfare of the entire race. And as we are very apt to crave temporal gifts, to desire exemption from poverty, pain, detection, ignominy, without much thought as to whether or not these gifts will, we being what we are at the time, promote our real and lasting welfare, we ought to be the more careful, we ought to examine our motives with the more searching inquest, when we bring to God such requests as these. Only as our motives are pure, only as we have respect to the true ends of life, only as we ask what will really contribute to that welfare which is the will and aim of God, can we reasonably hope, or even reasonably desire, that He will give us that which we ask of Him.

"Still," it may be objected, "if we grant all this, if we grant that God may reasonably answer prayers the answers to which will promote the well-being of men; if, moreover, we grant that it might be well were God to answer such prayers even when to answer them He must vary, or modify, or transcend the operation of natural laws, have we any reason to think that He does thus vary, or modify, or transcend them? Have we not, rather, many and conclusive reasons to believe that He invariably abides by them? The analogies you have taken from human life break down when we apply them to God. A judge, a master, a father may rightly deviate from domestic or business or legal rules; for no rules devised by human wit can be perfect, and perfectly applicable to all cases and occasions. But God is of an absolute wisdom. May not his laws, then, be so perfect that no deviation from them can ever become

necessary, so comprehensive and flexible that they fit themselves smoothly and infallibly to every contingency? And in point of fact do we not find that He never does depart from them?"

The answer to this grave and difficult objection, briefly put, I take to be as follows. Those who look to the material universe alone for hints on the character and rule of God sometimes forget what at other times they proudly assert, that man is the crown of created things, the paragon of the world. They forget that as the highest thing they know is life, so the highest and noblest forms of life are found in the reason, will, conscience, and affections of man. They forget that we must therefore see more of God in life, and above all in the highest forms of human life, than in whatever else the universe contains. *We* must not forget, we must constantly remember that, since we are more likely to find some faint resemblance of the Most High in the highest things we know, we must look to man, and above all to that which is highest and noblest in man, that is, his spiritual faculties and affections, for the most accurate indications of the character and ways of God. But if, as we are bound, we go to Man rather than to Nature for our conception of God, and to determine whether or not He is likely to answer prayer—do we find that in proportion as men grow good and wise it becomes vain for us to carry to them any, even the most reasonable, requests? On the contrary, as our whole argument implies, it is precisely the wise and good to whom we take our reasonable requests with the most confident expectation and hope. Do we even find that

as men grow good and wise that they are more and more bound by law, that they adhere more and more strictly to any set of rules or to any prescribed methods of action? Rather we find (1) that the wiser and abler and better they are, the more can they so obey all laws as to produce greater results from and through them than when they stood on a lower stage of culture; and (2) that they can the more easily, if there be need, graciously dispense with and transcend all laws, in order to reach a higher end than a mere observance of law and rule would enable them to reach. Think, for example, how the great and practised artist both obeys the rules of his art until he masters them and they are no longer bonds or restraints to him, but feet and hands and wings; and how he also rises above them, so that in his finest work there is always much which cannot be brought under any law, or at least any known law. Think with what effect a great poet, a Shakespeare, observes all the ascertained laws of dramatic art, and with what still greater effect he transcends them, so that we have to make new laws for him, and even then find that that which is most divine in his work is irreducible to law and rule. Think what noble and gracious courtesy a gentleman may shew while observing all the rules of social intercourse; and yet how many a plain man, without observing those rules, with nothing but a gentle and a Christian heart to guide him, may shew a still finer and more generous courtesy than he. Think how all the great examples of moral excellence, even up to Christ Himself, have shewn a righteousness beyond that of law—this supra-legal

righteousness being their sovereign charm and power. Genius, indeed, whether it be mental or moral genius, is always law-less; *i.e.*, there is always much in it that cannot be brought under rule: and that in it which cannot be brought under rule and law is precisely that in it which all the world admires as most rare, most exquisite, most excellent. If, then, we are to frame our conception of God, not on the hints supplied by the material universe alone, but rather on the nature of Man, who is the crowning glory of the universe, and whom the Scriptures declare to be the very "image of God," and on that which is highest and rarest and best in him, we shall at least hesitate before admitting that there is nothing in God which may not be reduced under terms of law.

And when we more attentively consider the material world itself, and how and to what extent the operation of natural laws is modified by human intelligence and will, we shall even deny that there is nothing in it except the laws and forces which science has discovered and tabulated. It is not easy so much as to imagine what a vastly different world this planet would have been had man never been born into it, or to what an enormous extent he has reshaped it by modifying and contracting the action of the laws of Nature upon it. But those who hold that there is no room for the play of Intelligence and Free-will among the laws by which the universe is governed, will do well to consider what changes man has wrought upon the face of Nature. Who has not seen these changes taking place in the immediate vicinity of his own town within the last twenty or thirty years? Who does not find that practically the little world in

which he dwells has become a changed world? And how shall we calculate the immense changes wrought upon the surface of the globe through the historic ages by the art and industry of man? By making roads, felling forests, draining the fields, embanking streams and flinging bridges over them; by building cities, digging harbours and piling up sea walls, and by a thousand similar processes he has, as it were, remade the earth and even reached up a hand to the clouds of heaven and driven the rainfall from land to land. And if the will of man finds such free and ample scope among the laws and forces of Nature, so that, in a myriad ways, he can bend them to his purpose, must not the Will of God find room and verge enough to play freely among them, and to bend them to his purposes with a subtlety and potency infinitely beyond the reach of man?

Nor is it only by these large and intentional processes that men affect and control the course of Nature. The most trivial and careless action of even the least capable and influential of men may have consequences which Science itself can hardly calculate. Some of the consequences of such an action were traced in the "Quarterly Journal of Science" for January, 1875. In effect it ran thus: Here is a gardener who may dig twenty more spadefuls before dinner, or only nineteen. That surely is a point which he is free to determine, a point which is determined for him by no physical force or law. But how much may depend on even this trivial determination of his will. On whether or not he digs that twentieth spadeful it may depend whether a slug is turned up or not; on the slug may depend the dinner of a young swallow

who is feeble on the wing; on this single meal may depend whether the bird shall join the migratory flock and reach Africa in safety: but on this fledgling's arrival or non-arrival may depend whether a certain insect shall be snapped up by him, or left to lay a million eggs, which, in that case, will next month be each a locust laying a million more; and on this billion of locusts and their progeny it may depend whether by Christmas a vast tract of country shall be green as Eden or a leafless wilderness, and its mean temperature 100° or only 70°; and on whether such an area be the hottest or coolest portion of the tropics may well depend the winds, and the drought or rain of a season over half, or the whole, of Europe. All these events, and many more, may depend on the single, unstudied, momentary act of a man who is quite free to do that act or to leave it undone! And when we reflect how many such acts must be done every day, and how wide and momentous and complex their consequences are, we cannot but admit that the will of man counts for much even in the physical universe. Why, then, should the will of God count for nothing? If the laws of the physical universe leave room and scope for the free play of our wills, if the results they produce are so largely and constantly modified by human action, who will contend that they leave no room for the volition of God, and that He can only act as they prompt or permit Him to act? If by accident, and by design, men can change the natural order of events, and turn it into currents in which it would not otherwise have run, we may be very sure that God can so vary and modify it as to promote our welfare and to grant

us whatever it may be for our good to receive. Just as Carlyle[1] declares it to be flatly inconceivable that intellect, conscience, will, affection, could have been put into man "by an Entity that had none of its own;" so we may affirm it to be flatly inconceivable that God should have given men so great a power over the laws and forces of the material world and yet be incapable of exerting any such power Himself.

CARPUS.

ST. JOHN'S VIEW OF JESUS ON THE CROSS.

ST. JOHN xix. 28–37.

II.—BEFORE speaking of an important point in *Verse* 30, we turn to *Verses* 36 and 37, to the passages of Scripture quoted there, and to the circumstances in which it is said that these Scriptures were fulfilled. The two passages quoted are introduced with the words, "For these things took place that the Scriptures might be fulfilled;" and we may take for granted, what is admitted by most commentators, that in "these things" we have a reference to the two circumstances mentioned in *Verses* 32–34, that the bones of Jesus were not broken, and that a soldier pierced his side with his spear. The question with which we are concerned is that which has occupied us hitherto, What is the point in the history of the paschal lamb to which these things refer?

The first text quoted in *Verse* 36 is, "A bone of him shall not be broken." It is taken, if not from Psalm xxxiv. 20, either from Exodus xii. 46, or from Numbers ix. 12, where, in connection with the ritual

[1] "History of Frederick the Great." Book xxi. chap. 9.

of the paschal lamb, the Divine commandment is given, "Neither shall ye break a bone thereof." To what stage in the ritual was this injunction applicable? The answer is unquestionable and clear. It had nothing whatever to do with the *killing* of the lamb. It referred only to the care with which the lamb was to be prepared for the table, and the meat, during the process of carving, separated from the bones. Without urging unduly the order of the clauses in the two passages of the law from which quotations are made by St. John, it will readily be granted by all who look at them that they are favourable to this view. In both, directions as to the mode of eating *precede* mention of the not breaking of the bones: "In one house shall it be eaten; thou shalt not carry forth ought of the flesh abroad out of the house; neither shall ye break a bone thereof:"—so runs the passage in Exodus, and to a similar effect in Numbers. But what is at once conclusive upon the point is this, that there was no risk of breaking the bones in the act of killing. The lamb was killed in the same manner as all other animals intended for sacrifice, not by stabbing in the breast, but by cutting the throat,[1] so that the bones were safe. It was *afterwards* that the danger existed, partly, perhaps, in transfixing for the fire, chiefly in carving at the table. The danger of then breaking a bone was to be guarded against with the utmost care, with a care so great that the Rabbins found it necessary to interpret the precept as applicable, not to all the bones, but only to such as had marrow in them, or were covered with flesh of the size of an olive,[2] and every

[1] Comp. Bochart, Hieroz. lib. ii. c. 50. [2] Ibid. lib. ii. c. 50, p. 609.

precaution was to be taken that the skeleton should leave the table entire.[1] In addition to this, it may be noticed that, if the words quoted by the Evangelist are taken, as seems most probable, from Psalm xxxiv. 20, they are not an image of what meets us most directly in the *death* of Jesus. They are rather an image of the care with which He is watched over by his heavenly Father: "Many are the afflictions of the righteous; but the Lord delivereth him out of them all. He keepeth all his bones; not one of them is broken." Nothing can be more certain than that this first passage from the Old Testament has no reference whatever to the lamb at the moment of its death, but only at that when it was distributed to the guests at the paschal meal.

The second of the texts quoted, that in *Verse* 37, "They shall look on him whom they pierced," is taken from Zechariah xii. 10. Omitting all notice of many interesting particulars connected with the words of the prophet in this verse, we call attention to the fact that these words are associated by him with the passover solemnities. This is clear from his words immediately following those quoted by St. John, "And they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him as one that is in bitterness for his first-born." It is the mourning of Egypt on the night when the passover was instituted that is in the prophet's eye. Can we doubt that when he says, "They shall look on me whom they have pierced," he had reference to the Paschal Lamb? Thus at least he is interpreted by St. John, and all that we have to ask is, To what

[1] Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," ii. 725.

stage in the history of the lamb does the "piercing" refer?

It cannot be to the killing of the lamb, for, as we have seen, this was accomplished by cutting the throat, and the action of drawing the knife backwards and forwards has not the slightest resemblance to what is described by ἐκκεντεῖν, a word invariably used in the sense of piercing or stabbing (Judges ix. 54; Numb. xxii. 29; Isa. xiv. 19). It must therefore refer to another moment altogether, either to that at which the lamb was pierced by the knife for carving, or that at which it was pierced for roasting. When we remember the manner in which it was roasted, suspended in a close vessel full of holes through which the heat of the fire penetrated; more especially if we accept, and there seems to be no reason why we should not, the statement of Justin,[1] that a double spit in the form of a cross was employed for the purpose, the latter supposition will probably appear to us the more likely one. It is not indeed clear that it is so. Unfortunately we do not exactly know what St. John means by the πλευρά which he tells us in *Verse* 34 the soldier pierced, but if it was the breast near the heart it hardly corresponds with the point at which the spit was inserted. On the other hand, one carving the lamb would naturally insert his knife in the breast, so that the symbolism might lead to the thought that this was the moment of the ἐκκεντεῖν. No decision upon the point is necessary to our argument. Whichever of these two moments be referred

[1] *Dial. c. Tryph.* sec. 40. Comp. modern usage of Samaritans in Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," ii. 715.

to, it is enough to observe that it is *subsequent* to the act of killing, that it is a moment when the lamb is thought of either as making, or as made, ready for the family meal. Nor only so; it is of importance to notice that the main act of the ἐκκεντεῖν in the case of Jesus is distinctly placed by the Evangelist *after* death. At *Verse* 30 we are informed that He "delivered up his spirit;" at *Verse* 33 that, when the soldiers came to Him for the purpose of breaking his legs, they found that He was "already dead;" and that then, thereafter, one of them "pierced his side with his spear, and straightway there came forth blood and water." The spear-thrust has thus nothing to do with the cause of death, as little as it has to do with any proof that Jesus was dead. It is simply the means by which that blood and water came forth in which the Evangelist sees the blessings of redemption symbolized. Apart, therefore, from all other reasons, and simply following the direct teaching of the narrative, we must connect the piercing not with the moment of death, but with some later stage when the victim that has died is to be partaken of as food. In other words, St. John must see Jesus, when He hangs upon the cross as the Paschal Lamb, not in the instant of death, but then when it is prepared for the paschal meal.

III.

We turn now to *Verse* 30, to words of which we have hitherto said nothing, and which at first sight may appear inconsistent with the view of the scene before us taken in these pages. A closer consideration of that verse will, it is hoped, dispel this impres-

sion, and instead of contravening, powerfully confirm the conclusion that has been drawn. The words of *Verse* 30 run: "When Jesus had received the vinegar he said, It is finished; and he bowed his head, and delivered up his spirit." Here it may be said is death. At this moment the Evangelist sees Jesus, as the Paschal Lamb, die by the power and malice of his enemies. He cannot, therefore, be regarded as already in any sense dead. The point is one of the deepest interest and importance, and the following considerations are submitted in regard to it.

In the first place, if, as is unquestionably the fact, Jesus on the cross is the Paschal Lamb, the incongruity of supposing that his death endured there is the only death to be spoken of in connection with Him can hardly fail to strike every reader. The paschal lamb was not put to death by enemies, but by friends; by Israel itself in one of its high solemnities, and by express command of the Almighty.

In the second place, the words in which the fact of death is mentioned are of so marked a kind as to compel the thought of something else, whatever it may be, than a death brought about only by the violence of foes. The force of this consideration is indeed lost in the English Version, owing to its inadequate rendering of the last clause of the verse with which we are now dealing, "He gave up the ghost." The original is *παρέδωκε τὸ πνεῦμα*, and the imperfection of the Authorized Version will be allowed when it is remembered that the phrase of the second and third Evangelists, *ἐξέπνευσεν*, is rendered by precisely the same words (Mark xv. 37; Luke xxiii. 46), and that that of the first, *ἀφῆκεν τὸ πνεῦμα*, is only varied

to the extent of "yielded up" instead of "gave up" (Matt. xxvii. 50). The true rendering is, "Delivered up his spirit." Can this expression mean that at that instant the enemies of Jesus triumphed by accomplishing his death? It is far too peculiar to permit us to rest satisfied with such an explanation; nor does it meet the exigencies of the case to interpret (with Lücke) as if we had here only a manifestation of the filial piety of Jesus; as if the meaning were simply that of Psalm xxxi. 5, "Into thine hands I commit my spirit." It evidently implies a deliberate act on the part of Jesus, something done by Him, and not to Him, in which He Himself is the agent instead of being passive in the hands of others. We must agree, therefore, with the many distinguished commentators who see in the remarkable words of St. John an intimation that it was not owing merely to the power and malice of his enemies that Jesus died, but that He died, to use the language of Doddridge (*in loc.*), "by the voluntary act of his own mind."[1] The language of Alford is particularly clear. "Our Lord's death was *his own act*—no feeling the approach of death, as some, not apprehending the matter, have commented—but a *determinate delivering up of his spirit to the Father*" (on Luke xxiii. 46. The italics are his.). No other interpretation does justice to the text. The death of Jesus was "free, personal, spontaneous" (Godet). It was the carrying out of his own words in Chapter x. 17, 18, "Therefore doth the Father love me, because I lay down my life

[1] Comp. McKnight, Luthardt, Alford, Lange, Meyer, Godet, Tholuck, the latter saying, with the greatest divines of the Lutheran Church, that the death of Jesus was "nicht ein Leiden sondern eine That."

that I may take it again. No one taketh it away from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This charge I received from my Father." The attendant circumstances corresponded to this view. It was not in weariness and exhaustion that Jesus died. St. Matthew tells us, that "when he had cried again with a *loud voice*, he yielded up his spirit;" and the statement of St. John that, immediately before doing so, "he bowed his head," is a proof that up to that instant his head had been erect, not drooping under his burden of sorrow and pain. It is not the Jews, then, who at this instant accomplish the death of Jesus. Such at least cannot be the *whole* explanation of the scene. There is another thought in the mind of the Evangelist. To him the moment is not that of long-continued persecution and mockery culminating at last in a cruel death at the hands of wicked men now completely successful in their aims. It is a moment in which the victim of their rage escapes, deliberately frees himself, from their power; a moment similar in spirit to that of Chapter v. 13, though more marked, as was fitting, in degree. "Jesus withdrew himself, a multitude being in the place."

In the third place, there is at least one passage in the Gospel which distinctly implies that at a time several days anterior to this the death of Jesus had already, both in his own view and in that of the Evangelist, been accomplished. Adopting the later and best attested reading of Chapter xii. 7, we find Jesus saying there of Mary, *Ἄφες αὐτήν, ἵνα εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ ἐνταφιασμοῦ μου τηρήσῃ αὐτο*—that is, "Suffer

her to have kept this against the day of my preparation for burial,"[1] against *the day which has now come.* In other words, "Blame her not for having so kept this, and having so used it now." Mary had *emptied* her vial of precious ointment on the person of Jesus; there was nothing left to keep for any future day; and Jesus interprets her act as a *preparation for his burial,* for ἐνταφιασμός never means burial itself. The Saviour thus brings Himself before us as *already dead,* not indeed actually so, but dead in the accomplishment of a death which He came to die, and which, therefore, in some most essential characteristic of death, must have taken place before He could be embalmed and the house filled with the odour of the ointment. St. John enters into this aspect of the case; and, *long before* Jesus hangs upon the cross, he represents Him, explain it how we may, as one who has already died. When, at a later period, Jesus "delivers up his spirit," it is his own free act of return to his Father.

In the fourth place, the aorists of Chapter xvii. 4 can only be thoroughly explained upon this supposition, "I glorified thee on the earth, having accomplished the work which thou hast given me to do."

In the fifth place, the suffering of death upon the cross by Jesus is always in this Gospel (comp. especially Chap. xii. 32) not defeat at the hands of enemies, but a victory, a "lifting up."

[1] Comp. McClellan *in loc.* McClellan is right in his criticism there directed against the writer of these pages, who, fixing his attention upon another point, had too hastily adopted a translation of these words which fails to bring out the sense.

In the sixth place, the sacrificial nature of the death of Christ in which St. John certainly believed, the thought of which is indeed involved in the very idea that Jesus is the Paschal Lamb, is not associated in the mind of the Evangelist with blood shed *in the moment of dying* by the Redeemer. The blood which he sees in connection with Jesus crucified issues from his side *after* death (Chap. xix. 33, 34). What the meaning of this may be we are not now called upon to ask. It is the fact alone with which we have to do.

In the seventh place, is there anything unnatural in the supposition that, in the deeper meaning of the word, Jesus had really died before the moment when breath left his body on the cross? So far from that, the whole tone of the Fourth Gospel militates against the idea that breathing out of life was the main element of the death that Jesus died. His rather was a continual dying. In the suffering and sorrow rendered necessary by his heavenly Father's will, He "died daily." His offering of Himself was not confined to the cross, is not even mainly to be sought in the physical pain and agony of that departing hour. It is to be sought in the whole work which He accomplished on behalf of man. It was finished when his work was finished; and the delivering up of his spirit on the cross was but the final step in which St. John sees Him return to his heavenly Father. The Evangelist draws a distinction between death in its deeper sense and what we call death. The latter takes place in the verse now under consideration. The former, in the idealism of our Gospel, had taken place before; and so

far, therefore, is *Verse* 30 from being opposed to the view now advocated of our passage as a whole, that it is rather a most striking confirmation of it.

We add only one further consideration. To the Jewish method of conception the paschal lamb inevitably suggested not the thought of its death alone, but that of its being placed upon the table for food after death. The sacrificial killing was no doubt an essential element in the complex thought: we urge only that no Jew could rest in this. To him the necessary complement of "our passover is sacrificed for us," was "therefore let us keep the feast." He could not think of it in the killing only; the eating also was always present to his mind. "*Fundamentum Paschatis,*" says Bartenora in his comment on the Mishna, "*est ut comedatur ab hominibus;*" and to a similar effect Maimonides, "*Jam tibi constat quod Pascha tantum veniebat ut comederetur.*" [1]

It remains only to sum up what has been said, and to draw the inference suggested by it.

Every part of the passage before us, then, it will be observed, directs our thoughts to Jesus as the Paschal Lamb. That is admitted. Our contention is that, this being so, Jesus is here the Paschal Lamb, not in the moment of death, but at a subsequent stage, when it was prepared for the paschal meal and eaten at it. Mention is made of the vinegar, of the hyssop, of the putting these to the mouth, in such a peculiar manner that, only on this supposition, are they adequately explained. The quotations from the Old Testament, together with the circumstances fulfilling them, lead, in a way hardly admitting of controversy,

[1] Surenhusius, Pesachim, vii. 5.

to the same conclusion. The striking singularity of the language in which the death of Jesus is described confirms, instead of weakening, the impression. Repugnance may indeed be felt, and objection made, to what has been said as to the Evangelist's seeing in the conduct of the Jews the partaking of an inverted and contorted passover. Further reflection may shew that this is not so objectionable as it seems, that in reality it throws a fresh and, if true, a striking light upon the whole conduct and fate of those who were now crucifying their Messiah and their King. At Chapter xviii. 28 they had not entered into the judgment hall of Pilate "lest they should be defiled, but that they might eat the passover." They had not eaten it then. Amidst the tumult and stormy passions of that dreadful morning, when had they an opportunity of eating it? St. John does not tell us that they found one. Rather is the whole narrative so constructed, so full of close, rapid, passionate action, that it is impossible to fix upon any point at which we can insert their eating until it was too late in the day to make it legal. *May it not be that they found no opportunity?* They lost their passover. Lost it? Nay, the Evangelist seems to say they found a passover. Follow them with me to the cross; and there, in their cruel mockeries of the true Paschal Lamb, let us see the righteous dealings of God as He makes these mockeries take the shape of a passover of judgment, a passover of added sin and deepened shame. There is nothing in the conception more strange than that, in Hosea iv. 15, the Almighty should say to Israel, "Neither go ye up to Beth-Aven," when He means Beth-el.

But whether this be correct or not, it does not affect the main result of our investigation, that throughout the passage, Chapter xix. 28–37, Jesus is the Paschal Lamb prepared for the Paschal Supper.

We have yet to speak of the inference suggested by what has been said, one of a critical and exegetical, not of a dogmatic, kind.

The importance of one passage in modern controversy with regard to the authenticity and authority of the Fourth Gospel is well understood. It may be justly characterized as the leading passage depended on for the view of that Gospel which makes it not a historical but an ideal composition. Jesus, it is said, is the Paschal Lamb; in order that He may be so He must die at the moment when the lamb was killed; therefore, to shew that He actually did thus die, St. John must make Him eat the passover with his disciples twenty-four hours before the legally appointed time. He does so; in the interests of his idealism he perverts the facts of history; here, as through an *experimentum crucis*, we determine the unreliable nature of his Gospel.

By what has been shewn to be the true bearing of the narrative, this whole fabric falls at once to the ground. So far from its being required by the symbolism that Jesus should die at the hour when the paschal lamb died, the symbolism would be destroyed were that the case. While He hangs upon the cross He is already the Lamb *upon the table*. His death, at least in thought, in the true ideal of the scene, is over. He is now food for the guests invited to his supper. A perversion of history in the direction indicated would have blotted out the most distinctive

features of the picture which the Evangelist is concerned to present. The most powerful motives that could guide his pen, even if an ideal one, were precisely such as would lead him to say that Jesus did *not* die at the hour when the Paschal Lamb was sacrificed, and to accept those facts of history which he has been too hastily supposed to do his best to overthrow.

WM. MILLIGAN.

A CHAPTER OF GOSPEL HISTORY.

8.—THE GRACIOUS INVITATION. (*St. Matt.* xi. 28, 29.)

THIS word of gracious invitation to labouring and burdened men appears to have been uttered in immediate connection with the word which we considered in our last paper, and fitly closes a remarkable Chapter, which tells how Jesus was subjected to doubting interrogation by his own forerunner; how He was thereby led to characterize the Baptist in his strength and in his weakness, and to reflect on the unworthy treatment which both Himself and John had received from a fickle and foolish generation; and how bitter thoughts of the contemptuous unbelief of the wise, and of the unstable belief of the multitude in Capernaum and the other cities by the shores of the Galilean lake, threw Him back for consolation on his consciousness of Divine dignity as the Son and the Revealer of the Father. How natural, how characteristic, that the despised and rejected One, having first by an act of religious devotion sought solace in the bosom of his Father, should next seek further consolation to his wounded spirit by turning to needy human beings, whose

condition was such as to make them ready to give Him and his evangel welcome! For the Son of God is also Son of Man, and He is not content with getting sympathy from the Lord of heaven and earth; He must also have the satisfaction of *giving* sympathy and succour to miserable men. His loving heart yearns to meet with some who shall not criticize merely, but believe; and, believing, find rest. Therefore, having spoken to his Father in audible prayer, alone in spirit though outwardly surrounded by many who heard the mysterious words, He suddenly changes his tone, and addressing Himself to his followers, says, "Come unto me, all ye labouring and burdened ones, and *I* will cause you to rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and humble in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is kindly, and my burden is light."

These words were meant for all ages and for all men. The Speaker has just claimed for Himself a position of central and absolute importance in the world as the Mediator between God and man; and we are entitled to assume that his words are meant in the most comprehensive sense as having a world-wide range, as spoken to all men in all ages, as referring to all sorts of burdens, and as promising absolute perfect rest. More than any other words of Jesus in the Gospels these possess the fundamental attributes of the Christian religion, spirituality and universality. The Son of Man addresses Himself to humanity with reference to all that pertains to humanity's deepest well-being. He speaks, indeed, immediately to the people round about Him, but

not to them alone; but to the children of sorrow everywhere and in all time, whom sorrow has made wise enough to hunger for salvation and to welcome a Saviour. His ideal audience is humanity at large; and He, the Son of Man, connected by human ties with the race, hopes to get a patient appreciative hearing from all the heavy-laden among them; from all who realize and lay to heart man's miserable plight as a creature burdened with sorrow, and care, and sin, and guilt, and ignorance, and doubt, and darkness. As the ages run on, may the tender loving voice of the Redeemer meet fitting response in many hearts, and bring peace to many souls!

As we remarked in our last paper, a recent writer on the life of Jesus has endeavoured to characterize the spirit of this passage, in contrast to the words going before, by the phrase, "Humility in the midst of elevation."[1] And there obviously is a contrast between the two utterances. Yet the contrast is relative only; for the dignity, the transcendent importance, of the Speaker is strongly, though indirectly, asserted even here, where it is the humility of the Speaker that is accentuated. Come to *me*, says Jesus, and *I*[2] will give you rest—claiming for Himself ability to do what no other had yet been found able to accomplish. The summons to take up his yoke also implies an assumption of superiority on the Speaker's part. The "yoke" meant is that which a master imposes on a disciple, or a lord upon a servant: he who takes up the yoke consents to become the Speaker's scholar, and to learn of Him. True there follow the marvellous words, "for I am

[1] Keim, *Jesu von Nazara*, ii. 391. [2] Κἀγώ. The "I" is emphatic.

meek and humble in heart," the very sound of which is soothing and rest-giving; but in the very act of uttering the words the meek and lowly One plays the part of Master. Here, as in the scene of the feet-washing, the Pattern of meekness prescribes Himself as a pattern, and so in effect asserts his lordship.

The Speaker being the Lord and Saviour of men, and the ideal audience the sinful and suffering sons of Adam, it is obvious that the gracious invitation may legitimately be made the subject of a very comprehensive exposition, far exceeding the limits of a purely historical exegesis which aims at nothing more than ascertaining what meaning the first hearers were likely to take out of the words. We may give the burden of man and the needed rest the widest definition, and bring them so defined to the text, and put them into it and take them out of it again. Such exegesis, which takes out of texts what we have previously put into them, is often very profitless, but in the present instance to interdict it might well seem a wrong done to the weary and sore distressed; and to restrict the expositor to a purely historical interpretation may not unnaturally be regarded as dooming him to humiliating failure. But, alas! expound as we please, with large or with limited scope, shortcoming is inevitable; for who is sufficient to unfold this utterance of the Blessed One? who can tell all that was in his heart when He spake the precious words? who can adequately conceive or express the bliss which it was in his heart and in his power to impart?

We shall try to give a mere hint, first, of what this

word of the Lord Jesus meant for its first hearers; and, next, what it means now and evermore for humanity at large.

The word "yoke" suggests the thought that Jesus had in his mind a contrast between Himself and the Rabbis or scribes, the "wise and understanding people" of whom He had previously spoken. These wise men were teachers of the law, and their disciples, in current Jewish phrase, bore their yoke. And the yoke which these masters of the law imposed on their disciples was anything but an easy and kindly one, as we know from the testimony of our Lord Himself. "They bind," He said, "heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's shoulders."[1] It is highly probable, therefore, that, having these legal teachers and their grievous yoke in view, Jesus here invites men who feel the legal yoke galling their spirits to come to *Him*, that they may find that which they have not found with the Rabbis—rest. Those who have already come to Him are for the most part persons happily ignorant of the law—babes. He now invites to join their company those who do know the law, and to whom knowledge has brought only weariness, sorrow, and vexation of spirit. That such persons existed in those days, the words above quoted from another part of Matthew's Gospel sufficiently attest; and that Christ felt compassion for them, is also plain from the same words, and might be taken for granted without any express evidence. What class of men were more likely to awaken sympathy in Christ's heart than those who groaned under the burden of

[1] Matt. xxiii. 4.

legalism—a burden which Peter in after days described as a "yoke which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear"?[1] Such burdened ones, then, Jesus invites to come to Him—men who have been instructed in all the details of a complicated ritualistic system, made more complicated by the traditions of the elders, and have been trying to order their lives in accordance with it, and who have found the task wearisome and vain, a very labouring for the fire: and He assures them of rest if they will but take his yoke upon them.[2] And whence this mighty difference between his yoke and that of the scribes and Rabbis? Hence: taking his yoke means *learning of Him.* "Learn of me:" that is, not merely accept me as your teacher, but learn *me* as your lesson. Put my life, my spirit, myself, in place of the complicated legal system the scribes have taught you. Christ invites to admiration, love, imitation of Himself—a living law, in place of irksome compliance with a thousand dead mechanical rules. Surely an immense relief to the human spirit, thus to be delivered from a vain conversation received by tradition from the fathers, and to have the conscience purged from dead works to serve the loving Son of God! What a difference between loving One full of grace and truth, the incarnation of Divine Love and Wisdom, and the treadmill life of the poor legalist who scrupulously strives to fulfil the behests of the Mosaic statute-book, and the precepts of Rabbis over and above! Especially easy does the yoke of the Christian disciple appear when the law of Christ, Christ's own moral excellence, is summed up in two

[1] Acts xv. 10. [2] Meyer and Neander both take this view.

words—"meek" and "humble in heart." The one epithet (πραΰς) denotes patience under the ills of life, the other (ταπεινὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ), the condescension of love which stoops to the meanest positions and functions in order to bless others.[1] But who can doubt that that heart has attained unto rest in which dwell the graces of patience and charity? The very peace of God, Christ's own peace, reigns there, in all situations and amid all trials.

Jesus adds, "For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light." And so it will be found to be by the man who has learned of Christ to the effect of being meek and humble. But here an objection naturally suggests itself. Is it not difficult to attain unto patience and the humility of a holy heavenly charity? Is it not even more easy to comply with any number of legal rules than to be humble, loving, patient? And if so, how can Christ's yoke be called easy, kindly, and his burden light? In reply we say it is difficult to be Christ-like; yet it cannot be said of Christ's yoke, as of that of the scribes, that it is irksome or galling. However difficult Christ's commandments may be to keep, they are, as the Apostle John says, not *grievous;* for it must be carefully noted that difficult and grievous are by no means synonymous. A law may be difficult to fulfil, and yet not grievous or burdensome to the spirit; a moral system may be very high pitched, yet not oppressive. In fact there is a sense in which it may be said that the loftier the morality the less burden-

[1] Olshausen (Comment. *in loc.*) distinguishes between ταπεινὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ and πτωχὸς τῷ πνεύματι, regarding the latter as a predicate of sinful men, and not applicable to Christ.

some it is. Just as the atmosphere is heavier in the valleys than on the mountain tops, so a low-pitched ethical system lies heavier on the human spirit than one which sets the ideal of life very high. "Be ye perfect, as your Father in heaven is perfect," is not an easy precept to keep; but who does not see that it is a less grievous commandment to any right-minded man than were one enjoining that we should not rise higher in conduct than the low moral level of pagan divinities? It is not the moral loftiness of a commandment which makes it burdensome or grievous. A commandment may be grievous either because of the arbitrary unreasonable nature of its contents, or because of the compulsory nature of its motive, or because of the indisposition of the person to whom the commandment is given. From the first cause the commandments of the scribes were grievous: they were essentially arbitrary and unreasonable. From a similar cause even the ceremonial law was grievous. That law was not indeed unreasonable, but it was a law suited to a state in which the capacity for appreciating reasons was not yet developed, and it became very irksome when that childish stage was passed. From the second cause, any law, even one in its own nature most reasonable, may be grievous. Every commandment is grievous when the motive in closest contact with the conscience is the fear of penalty. Terrorism, intimidation, makes all laws—the laws of the family, the laws of the school, the laws of the land, the laws of God—burdensome. The laws of the land, however just, are grievous to one who is induced to keep them solely by the fear of the gaol, the reformatory,

or the gallows. They are not grievous to one who delights in a sober righteous life, because he never thinks of the penalty, but does the right because he loves it. In this sense we are to understand the statement of the Apostle Paul, "The law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient." The law, with its penal sanctions, is made for those who, but for the penalty, would do the things which are contrary to the law; not for those who, without regard to the penalty, do of their own accord the things contained in the law. From the third cause, indisposition in the subject, laws not only eminently reasonable, but which seek to ensure obedience only by the sweetest persuasives, may be burdensome. The first commandment, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," enforced by the reason annexed, "I am the Lord thy God, who have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage," was in itself the opposite of grievous. But to a people whose sojourn in Egypt had made them familiar with the worship of the sacred ox, it was an irksome thing to be required to have no other God save Him who had delivered them out of the hands of their oppressors. God's most reasonable requirement was as burdensome to the indisposed minds of the people of Israel as the tables of stone on which the Ten Commandments were written. Indisposition will make any code of morals, however holy, just, and good, a very table of stone; and it needs that the law should be written on the heart in order that all sense of grievousness may be removed, which accordingly was promised as a characteristic blessing of the new covenant.

"I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts"—not on tables of stone, as of old.

None of these causes of grievousness come into play in connection with Christ's yoke. His law is in the first place characterized by "sweet reasonableness." His moral sayings commend themselves at once to our hearts and consciences as good, acceptable, and perfect. Easy to keep they certainly are not; the opposite is plainly declared in the words spoken to the disciples on the occasion of the feet-washing: "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them." Still, Christ's commandments, however difficult, are not grievous. In the language of the Psalmist, his righteousness is like the great mountains, high, difficult to climb, yet objects of never-ceasing admiration, and by their very altitude provoking desire to make the ascent, and drawing the enthusiastic climber by an irresistible attraction upward toward their snowy summits. Then, secondly, Christ could say with truth, "My yoke is easy, and my burden is light," because the motives He appeals to are not compulsory, but persuasive. One, the only one expressly alluded to, is his own example—"Learn of me, I am meek and lowly in heart; be as I am." In this respect Jesus stands in marked contrast to the scribes. They bound heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and laid them on men's shoulders, *but they themselves would not move them with one of their fingers.* He, on the other hand, said to his disciples, Imitate me; and by placing all duty in imitation of Himself, He made his yoke easy: for what disciple will complain who is required simply to be as his master? Another motive

not referred to in the text (though it is latent in the words "humble in heart," "He humbled himself, and became obedient, even unto death"), but well known to Christians now, is gratitude for the blessing of redemption, for relief from the burden of guilt. Paul alludes to this motive when he says, "I beseech you, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice;" and again, "Ye are bought with a price; therefore glorify God in your body;" and once more, "The love of Christ constraineth us." The power of this motive was not unknown to some even in Christ's own lifetime, as, *e.g.*, to the woman "who was a sinner," and who afterwards appears to have joined those who followed Him and ministered unto Him of their substance.[1] Admiration, gratitude, surely these are motives fitted to make the burden of obedience light! Our Master and Lord has recourse not to intimidations but to *inspirations*, the inspiration of a lofty moral ideal realized in Himself, and the still more powerful inspiration that proceeds from the cross. Surely these inspirations ought to make his yoke easy and kindly! Surely meditation on the life and death of Christ ought to be as wings, helping us to soar to the mountain heights of duty; or as military music, inspiring courage, banishing fear, and causing us to march to battle and hardship and danger with a light step and a gay cheerful spirit! Arduous, difficult, the Christian life will be found to be by all who earnestly attempt it. But in this respect it is not singular. All things *noble* are difficult. Art is difficult, as well as Christian holiness. But it is no hardship to the artist to be required to excel in his

[1] Luke vii. 37; *cf.* viii. 1–3.

art. He imposes on himself the obligation, without waiting for the commandment of a master. His own ideal obliges him; and if that ideal has been suggested to him by the study of the works of a famous master, the fact does not discourage, but rather stimulates. The ideal and the example together stimulate him to effort, and give him no rest till he have reached a tolerable approximation to both. Even so is it with all genuine disciples of Jesus. As for those who are not genuine disciples, we take no account of them. Were we to include them among the number of disciples, we should have to admit that Christ's yoke, like other yokes, may be made grievous through indisposition. As a matter of fact there are multitudes of so-called Christians to whom, from this cause, Christ's yoke is grievous; knowing their Lord's will, but unwilling to do it; not in sympathy with the heroic unworldly spirit of Christian morality, content with the morally commonplace, and living as mere drudges down even on that low level. But such have never yet come to Christ's school. They are legalists, disciples of the scribes and Pharisees, carrying God's law not in their hearts, but, so to speak, on their backs, written on tables of stone, and staggering under the weight of obligation. Christ's genuine disciples have his spirit in them—"If any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his." Having Christ's spirit in them, they find his yoke easy, and can run in the way of his commandments. "Whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world."

Thus far we have considered the gracious invitation as addressed principally to those who, weary of legalism, hungered for another righteousness than

that of the scribes and Pharisees. It was worth our while to dwell at considerable length on this view of the passage, because, when regarded from this point of view, the words have an important bearing on the question how far Jesus meant to set aside the Jewish law. On this subject He was comparatively reticent. The number of his express utterances thereon are very few, and we are left to gather his mind rather from the undercurrent of his teaching than from explicit formal declarations. Nowhere in the Gospels, for example, do we find such a saying as that of Paul, "Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God."[1] If such a word had been found among the sayings of the Church's Head, it would have saved much trouble in after days. And yet who does not feel, in reading the Beatitudes, or this gracious invitation, that Christ *means* what Paul *says?* Circumcision, ritualism, legalism, are nothing to Him who issues this invitation. He addresses Himself to men in the same state of mind as Paul when he had come to see that legal righteousness was futile; and those who respond to his call will pass into a spiritual condition essentially analogous to that of the Apostle when he was converted to Christianity. Hence if we wish to know what the rest Jesus promises in its fully developed form is, we have but to inquire what Paul gained when he ceased to be a Pharisee and became a Christian. Through the case of Paul we may learn what Jesus undertakes to do for humanity at large; the experience of the Apostle of the Gentiles being as it were typical of the universal experience of man-

[1] 1 Cor. vii. 19.

kind, helping us to know in its full extent man's need, and Christ's ability to meet it.

From St. Paul's Epistles we learn that he found in Christ three forms of rest: rest to his *conscience*, through deliverance from sin; rest to his *mind*, through the knowledge of God; and rest to his *heart*, in an object of affection whom he might love with all the enthusiasm of which he was capable, without risk of idolatry. All these things men need. Each part of their nature has its own peculiar burden, and unless Christ can deliver from all the three burdens He is not entitled to say without qualification to the labouring and heavy-laden, "Come unto me, and I will give you rest." Paul being witness, Christ is able to remove all these burdens. With reference to the first, the burden of conscience, he represents Christ as removing it by bearing men's sin in Himself. "He hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him."[1] With reference to the second, the burden of ignorance, he represents Christ as removing it in virtue of his being the Incarnate Wisdom, the Revealer of God, "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge," "who is of God made unto us wisdom," whom to know it is worth one's while "to count all things but loss."[2] With reference to the third, the burden of an empty or selfish heart, he represents Christ as removing it by taking possession of the heart through his self-sacrificing love, and moving it to adopt in turn, as its principle of life, the spirit of self-sacrifice. "The love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all,

[1] 2 Cor. v. 21. [2] Col. ii. 3; 1 Cor. i. 30; Phil. iii. 8.

then all died: and that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him who died for them, and rose again."[1] And Paul's testimony is confirmed on all these points by multitudes of Christians who have had similar experiences. Still, as of old, the Cross speaks peace to troubled consciences, doubtless through the medium of diverse theologies and theories of atonement, but essentially in the same way for all. Still, too, as of old, Christ proves Himself able to relieve perplexed minds of the heavy burden of ignorance concerning God and human destiny. The Son reveals the Father. To those who cannot be content with the unknown God of modern philosophy, and who feel the mystery of life like an intolerable burden on the heart, who in effect offer up the prayer of the old Greek poet—

> Pity our eagerness to know
> From whence we come and whither go;
> How stole into the world, and why,
> Sin, and her daughter, misery.
> Teach us to whom among the blest
> Prayer must be offered and sin confest;
> That the heavy-laden and sore distress'd
> May to their weary souls find rest[2]—

to such Jesus replies: "I am the way, the truth, and the life. He that hath seen me hath seen the Father. God is a Father. I, the Son of Man, am also his Son; in and through me, ye, too, are sons of God." Such, in brief, is Christ's theology. Most satisfactory, rest-giving theses, truly, to those whose

[1] 2 Cor. v. 14.

[2] Fragment of Euripides, translated by D'Arcy W. Thompson in *Sales Attici*, p. 183.

minds cannot rest in the Great Unknowable, the Ultimate Force, the unconscious Reason of Nature, the impersonal Moral Order of the world, the neuter Power not ourselves making for righteousness!

Finally, Christ is still able to deliver men from the burden of an unsatisfied, empty, and therefore heavy heart, which cannot find its portion in the outward, the transient, the material. To men labouring under this burden Christ says, "Love not the world; love me, and all will be well. You have been the slaves of your desires and affections hitherto, and now you feel the yoke galling. Come to me, then; become my disciples; learn to live as I live; put me in the place of possessions and friends; love me as ye have hitherto loved these—passionately, supremely—and your hearts will be at rest from the fever of life in the sweet, peaceful, divine rest of a meek and lowly mind." And his promise is not vain. Rest does come to those who so act, rest whose perfection is proved by its power to maintain itself in the midst of trouble and care. For while we live these things will be.

> If I find Him, if I follow,
> What his guerdon here?
> Many a sorrow, many a labour,
> Many a tear.

Yet sorrow, labour, and tears notwithstanding, the peace of God that passeth all understanding keeps the heart and mind of the man who has taken Christ's yoke upon him.

ALEX. B. BRUCE.

NOTES ON COMMENTARIES.

6.—THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

IT is singular that, while as yet we hardly possess as many commentaries of real value on the Gospels as there are Gospels to be commented on, we have the most copious and efficacious aids to the study of the only other historical book in the New Testament.

Of direct expositions, critical and exegetical, of the Acts of the Apostles, I may name two, Dr. Hackett's[1] and Dr. Gloag's,[2] as probably the best in our language. Each of them is marked by sound scholarship, good common sense (an invaluable quality in an expositor), a candid and devout spirit. Each of them perhaps is a little wanting in those finer qualities of spiritual insight and historical imagination which lift a commentary into the very first rank, but the English student will find in them both much that is really valuable and helpful to him; and, if he must make a choice, he will do wisely, I think, to give Dr. Gloag's work the preference.

Even Biscoe on the Acts,[3] though somewhat antiquated, contains much that is both valuable and suggestive. Not a commentary, but a series of Apologetical Lectures, it deals mainly with such confirmations of the accuracy of the sacred historian as are to be derived from Hebrew, Greek, and Roman annals, literatures, and customs. Like good old Dr. Bennet's "Lectures on the Acts"—from which also a shrewd hint may be gathered now and then—a second-hand copy of it may often be picked up for a mere trifle, and those to whom the chance comes would do well to avail themselves of it. If any modern scholar would write a book on Biscoe's lines, bringing it down to date, and illustrating it from the vast store of discoveries which have rewarded recent critical study and research,

[1] Published by Hamilton, Adams, & Co. One Vol.
[2] Published by Clarks of Edinburgh. Two Vols.
[3] Published at the Clarendon Press (A.D. 1839). One Vol.

he would render no small service to the student and lovers of the New Testament.

Baumgarten's "Apostolic History" has long been accessible to the English reader in a translation published by Clarks of Edinburgh. Its special worth—for there are far abler commentaries on the Acts by German scholars—lies in its fundamental conception; viz., that the acts of the Apostles are really the acts of the risen and exalted Lord of the Church; that as the Gospels record what He "*began* to do" while He was on earth, so the Acts are a record of what He *continued* to do after He had passed into heaven. Those to whom this conception is new will find St. Luke's annals read very freshly in the light of it; and, in any case, Baumgarten's is a good book to have.

Of Conybeare and Howson's—especially Conybeare's—great work on "the Life and Epistles of St. Paul," there is no need to speak. Every one knows its worth. As a popular commentary on the major part of the Acts of the Apostles—for it does little for the Epistles beyond placing them in their true historic setting, and drawing from them details which illustrate the life of St. Paul, but this it does most admirably—it would be hard to praise it up to the mark of its deserts.

Less generally known, but not less deserving to be known—as I will try to shew in the next number of the Magazine—is Lewin's sumptuous work with the same title. It has one very special charm for ministerial students of the Word, that it is written by a layman, and from a layman's point of view.

The same charm—and a layman's work is specially valuable to ministers, just as a minister's work is, or should be, specially valuable to laymen—is possessed by a volume entitled "Paul of Tarsus." Though not a commentary, it will be found a grave assistance by those who have to expound the Scriptures of and concerning the Apostle of

[1] "Paul of Tarsus." An Inquiry into the Times and the Gospel of the Apostle of the Gentiles. London. Macmillans.

the Gentiles. It is a very able and sincere attempt to appraise the character of St. Paul, the kind of work he did, and the way in which that work has told upon the Church and the world. I do not know that I can give a better taste of the author's quality than in a few words on a question much disputed and often raised.

"It cannot be denied that the teaching of Christianity ignores patriotism. It ignores it, however, only because patriotism is transient, is inferior to the large purposes which can be obtained by evangelizing a federal humanity. The State is superior to the family, and asserts its claim to break up all domestic ties in view of the public good, for it sacrifices the father in the citizen. But it does not, except under this constraint, disparage the family: on the contrary, it cherishes and encourages the love of home. And, similarly, the claims of a federal humanity are stronger than those of patriotism, and as civilization advances the latter will be sacrificed if it clashes with the former. Patriotism is encouraged only as the school of a higher life. And it should be remembered that if patriotism has given magnificent examples of self-sacrifice, of heroic devotion, of ardent courage, of noble enterprize, these very qualities have been called out because a spurious loyalty has armed the oppressor with the power which a true patriotism has successfully defied. But where, alas, could the preacher of the apostolic age find the material for patriotic impulse in the hopeless slavery of the Roman Empire? He is turned, perforce, to the *civitas Dei*. He does not, indeed, forget to prescribe the conduct of a pure and happy home. Between that and the spiritual kingdom there was a desert. If the Lord had not shortened those days, no flesh should be saved." EDITOR.

II.

THAT CHRIST SPOKE GREEK.

I NOW proceed to deal with a very crucial question, as respects the subject under consideration. In what language, I venture to ask, was the *Sermon on the Mount* delivered? Most readers will doubtless be inclined at once to answer that it was in Aramaic. This is the almost universal opinion. The ablest and most elaborate works on this portion of Scripture, while touching upon every other point concerning it, quietly assume that its original language was Hebrew. In accordance, however, with the thesis I have undertaken to prove, I maintain the contrary, and affirm that the language used by our Lord on this great occasion was Greek; and that for the following reasons.

To *whom* was the discourse addressed? This question has obviously a most important bearing on the other as to the language in which it was spoken. Our Lord, of course, intended that his hearers generally should understand Him. He did not, therefore, employ a form of speech which, while it might be understood by some, would be unintelligible to others; but, ignoring provincial or local peculiarities of dialect, addressed them all in one common language.

Let us look, then, at the composition of his vast

audience, as that is suggested to us by St. Matthew. In the introduction to the great discourse recorded by that Evangelist, we read as follows (Chap. iv. 23–25): "And Jesus went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of sickness, and all manner of disease among the people. And his fame went throughout all Syria: and they brought unto him all sick people that were taken with divers diseases and torments, and those which were possessed with devils, and those which were lunatick, and those that had the palsy; and he healed them. And there followed him great multitudes of people from Galilee, and from *Decapolis*, and from *Jerusalem*, and from Judæa, and from beyond Jordan." And then we immediately read (Chap. v. 1, 2) that, "seeing the multitudes, he went up into a mountain: and when he was set, his disciples came unto him: and he opened his mouth and taught them, saying," &c. There can be no doubt that the discourse was addressed to the whole assemblage, so far as the mere hearing of it was concerned. Several passages, indeed, such as Chapter v. 13; vi. 9, &c., indicate that our Lord spoke more immediately to his disciples. But it is also plain from other passages that He spoke so as to be heard and understood by the multitude at large; for we are told (Chap. vii. 28), that "when Jesus had ended these sayings, the *people* (οἱ ὄχλοι) were astonished at his doctrine"—thus proving that his words had come home to them all, and that they had listened with some degree of intelligence to the weighty instruction which He delivered.

Now, have we any reason to believe that the

inhabitants of Decapolis understood Hebrew? Is it not, on the contrary, well known that the ten cities which gave its name to that region were thoroughly Greek, and that vast numbers of the population were not even Jews by religious profession, but heathen? It is difficult to ascertain, with exactness, the particular ten cities which were included in the district; and not improbably the name continued while some of the places once comprehended under it had sunk into decay. But there is no doubt as to the leading cities, which were Gadara, Gerasa, Philadelphia, Hippos, Pella, and Scythopolis; and the important point to be noticed is that, as Josephus informs us, these were thoroughly Greek cities. He expressly gives that name to Gadara and Hippos (Ἑλληνίδες εἰσὶ πόλεις),[1] and he refers to the others in such terms as leave no doubt that the Greek element prevailed largely among their inhabitants.[2] Nothing, indeed, is more certain, or more generally agreed upon by critics, than that the region of Decapolis was occupied almost exclusively by heathen settlers, or by Hellenizing Jews. It follows, therefore, as a matter of course, that as the Sermon on the Mount was intended to be understood, and actually *was* understood by inhabitants of that district among others, it must have been delivered in the Greek language.

This conclusion is greatly strengthened when we turn to the parallel passage in St. Luke. At Chapter vi. 17, we find the persons who were addressed described as follows:—"And he came down with them (the apostles), and stood in the plain, and the company of his disciples, and a great multitude of people

[1] *Antiq.* xvii. 11, 4. [2] *Wars*, ii. 18, 1.

out of all Judæa and Jerusalem, and from the sea coast of *Tyre* and *Sidon*, which came to *hear* him, and to be healed of their diseases." We thus learn that among our Lord's audience on this occasion there were the inhabitants at once of Jerusalem and of Tyre and Sidon. What then was the language in which they were addressed? Will any one maintain that it was Hebrew, in the face of that clear evidence which we possess that Greek was the only language then generally known in the region of Tyre and Sidon? Let me quote only one passage from Josephus bearing upon this point. He has preserved[1] an edict of Mark Antony sent to the people of Tyre, which begins as follows: "Marcus Antonius imperator, to the magistrates, senate, and people of Tyre, sendeth greeting. I have sent you my decree, respecting which I will that ye take care that it be engraven in the public tables, in Roman and Greek letters, and that it stand engraven in the most conspicuous places, so as to be read by *all*." It is plain from this that Greek was the language of the district, and that no other was commonly used; since, in addition to the official Latin, Greek was the only tongue in which the edict was commanded to be published.

There are just two views which can be taken of that portion of the Gospels we have been considering. The sermon (or, if you will, sermons) referred to was spoken either in Hebrew or Greek. If any one says Greek, he admits all for which I plead. If, on the other hand, any one maintains that it was Hebrew, he is bound also to maintain that the in-

[1] *Antiq.* xiv. 12, 5.

habitants of Decapolis and Tyre and Sidon then understood that language. In that case, I beg to demand the proof of such an allegation. I venture humbly, but confidently, to affirm that no proof of the kind can be produced. Assumptions may, no doubt, be met with in several writers to the effect that what they call a Syro-Phœnician dialect was then prevalent in these regions; but not a vestige of evidence is presented. On the contrary, Gesenius expressly states, in his elaborate treatise on the ancient language of Phœnicia, that, from the time of Alexander downwards, it was gradually encroached upon by the Greek, until at length it became altogether extinct.[1] He thinks, indeed, from the evidence of a few coins of uncertain date, that it continued to be used, *aliquo modo*, down to the times of the Antonines, but is very far from suggesting that it was generally employed among the people in the days of our Saviour. And even granting that this was so, it would still remain to be shewn that the Syro-Phœnician and Syro-Chaldaic dialects were identical, or, if different, which of them was now adopted by our Lord, since He had hearers at this time both from Tyre and Jerusalem. The truth is, as I trust has been sufficiently proved, that neither the one nor the other was employed; but that the very Greek in substance which is still preserved in the Gospels—the peculiar orientalized Greek of Syria and Palestine, bearing throughout such a strong Shemitic colouring, and embalming, so to speak, some such Aramaic terms as *Raca* and *Morè*, which had, most naturally, forced their way into the lan-

[1] *Scripturæ Linguæque Phœnicia Monumenta*, p. 339.

guage—was made use of by our Lord in this the solemn and impressive commencement of his public ministry.

But then, as every one must feel, this is a *ruling* case with respect to the question under discussion. If our Lord spoke in Greek on the occasion referred to, it is certain that the inhabitants of Judæa and Jerusalem were thoroughly familiar with that language; and it would therefore be quite arbitrary to conclude that the Saviour ever employed any other in addressing them, unless a special intimation to that effect is made by the Evangelists, or some circumstances present themselves which render it probable that a departure from his usual practice did at anytime take place.

Let me next direct the reader's attention to those passages in the Gospels in which our Saviour on the one hand, or his hearers on the other, are represented as making *quotations* from the Old Testament. The question which here occurs is, In what language were these quotations made? To this question it may be answered: (1) That they were made directly from the original text in ancient Hebrew; or (2) that they were made in Aramaic; or (3) that they were made, as they still stand in the Gospels, from the Greek Version of the Septuagint. Let us examine these three hypotheses, with the view of ascertaining which of them alone can be regarded as consistent with the facts of the case.

First, then, there is probably a vague notion in the minds of ordinary readers that the citations referred to were made from the ancient Hebrew text. When we read, as we so often do, of the appeals

which our Lord and those around Him made to the *Scriptures*, we think, of course, of the Old Testament; and the impression is perhaps received and rested in, that the references were made to the original Hebrew. But a very few words are sufficient to refute this opinion. It is certain that, long before the birth of our Saviour, the ancient Hebrew had ceased to be generally known or used among the people. Every scholar admits that, at least a century before the commencement of our era, the old language of the Jews had sunk into disuse; and that, while it still continued to be studied by the learned as being the language of inspiration, it was, in the days of Christ, utterly unknown to the great majority of the nation. This being the case, it could not possibly have been in the ancient Hebrew that those quotations were made which occur in our Lord's addresses to the multitude, or which they employed at times in conversation with Him. Refer for an example of the first kind of quotation to Mark xii. 35–37, in which passage the Saviour is set before us teaching publicly in the temple, and introducing an Old Testament text into his discourse. "And the common people," we read (ὁ πολὺς ὄχλος, who certainly knew nothing of ancient Hebrew), "heard him gladly." Next, let us view the matter conversely, when the quotation from the Old Testament is made, not by Christ, but by the people. Turning to John vi. 31 for an example, we find the *multitude* (ὁ ὄχλος, *Verse* 24) addressing the Saviour in these words: "Our fathers did eat manna in the desert, as it is written, He gave them bread from heaven to eat." They thus quoted familiarly from the Book of

Psalms; and in what language was the quotation made? Certainly not in the *ancient* Hebrew, for, as all authorities admit, that language was then totally unknown to the great body of the people.

But, abandoning this first hypothesis, many will be inclined to take their stand on the second, and maintain that such quotations were made in Aramaic. This, however, may be shewn to be an equally untenable opinion with the former. The truth is, we have no satisfactory evidence that a translation of the Hebrew Scriptures *ever* existed in the Syro-Chaldaic language. Frequent reference is, no doubt, made in the writings of modern Biblical scholars to ancient Targums, or translations and paraphrases of the Old Testament, which were formerly in use among the Jews. But when we come to examine the matter, we find it is a mere assumption that these existed in the days of our Saviour; or that, if known at all, they circulated in a *written* form among the people. Can it be supposed that it was to such Versions our Lord referred when He said to his hearers, "Search the scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and these are they which testify of me"? These words evidently imply (whether the imperative or indicative rendering of ἐρευνᾶτε be adopted) that the people had easy and familiar access to the inspired writings, and that they could read and compare them, from beginning to end, without any dependence on rabbinical or sacerdotal aid. There must, therefore, at the time, have been some written Version current among the people. But, as has been already said, there is no evidence whatever that any such Version existed in the Ara-

maic language. It seems quite inconceivable that, if the Old Testament had then been in the hands of the Jews in an Aramaic form (as was of course the case if Christ's exhortation to "search the scriptures" referred to the sacred books in that language), all traces of such a Version should so utterly have disappeared. In fact, there is nothing except the necessity, which certainly then existed, of the people of Palestine possessing the Scriptures in a language more generally known than the ancient Hebrew, that gives any countenance to the idea that an Aramaic Version of the Old Testament was then current among them; and we have now to consider whether that necessity may not be shewn to have been met in another and better way than by assuming the existence of a translation which has left no trace, either of its origin or its influence, in the literature of antiquity.

I hold, then, that when the Saviour quoted the Scriptures of the Old Testament in his popular addresses, or when the people did so in conversation with Him and his disciples, such quotations were invariably made, more or less exactly, from the Septuagint translation. We know that this Greek Version of the whole of the ancient Scriptures had existed for long before the times of Christ. And we possess the clearest evidence, both in the writings of Josephus and in the several books of the New Testament, how commonly it was employed by the Jews of Palestine. We find, in fact, that most of the quotations which occur in the Gospels agree almost *verbatim* with the rendering of the Septuagint; and that those are very few indeed which seem to depart

from its phraseology, and follow more closely the original text. There is not a single passage presenting such variations but may, after all, be regarded as derived from the Greek Version. The differences in question are easily accounted for on the ground (1) of the citations having been made from memory; or (2) of a somewhat different text of the LXX. having been followed from that which is current at the present day; or (3) by taking into consideration the undoubted fact that our Lord and his apostles often introduced into their quotations from the Old Testament a few words which did not exist in the original, or gave the passage quoted a higher and more special significance than it at first possessed.

And thus at length we understand how the Saviour could have addressed to the Jews at large such a precept as, "Search the scriptures." That precept, as all must acknowledge, could not have referred to the inspired books in their original language. And even though it be admitted, without sufficient evidence, that written Chaldee translations of some parts of Scripture then existed, that does not much help the matter; for Chaldee, such as that of the most ancient Targums, was certainly not then the familiar language of the Jewish people. We conclude, therefore, that the words of our Lord above referred to pointed to the Septuagint; that his quotations were made from it; that it then constituted the *People's Bible* in Palestine, in fact; and that, therefore, they must have been thoroughly familiar with the Greek language.

Proceeding now to the Acts of the Apostles, we

find every Chapter giving more or less support to the proposition which I have undertaken to establish. Only a few out of many available passages can here be noticed.

First, then—In what language did Peter deliver his great sermon (Chap. ii. 14–36) on the day of Pentecost? It is plain that he addressed the whole multitude at one time, and in the same language. It is also plain from the result—the conversion of no fewer than three thousand—that they all understood him. He must, therefore, have used a form of speech with which they were all of them familiarly acquainted. What, then, was that form of speech? Was it the Greek or Aramaic which was the language common to all those "Jews out of every nation under heaven"? This is surely a question which it is not difficult to answer. I should think that, if any argument at all is required on the subject, there is enough to convince every one that Aramaic could not have been the language in question in the fact that we find, in the list of those addressed by the apostle, "men of Cyrene, and strangers of Rome, Jews and proselytes." Will any one maintain that these persons understood and employed Hebrew?

The reader should carefully observe that both the native and foreign Jews were *simultaneously* addressed on this occasion. This appears very plainly, among other proofs, from the exordium of the Apostle. He begins his address thus: "Ye men of Judæa (*Ἄνδρες Ἰουδαῖοι*), and all ye that dwell in Jerusalem (*καὶ οἱ κατοικοῦντες Ἰερουσαλὴμ ἅπαντες*), be this known unto you," &c.; and by these different appellations he can only mean, as is agreed by all critics, the native

Jews who were habitually resident in Jerusalem, and the temporary sojourners from other countries. Both classes were among his hearers, both were addressed in the same speech, and that speech was delivered in the Greek language. Can any one of these statements be controverted or refuted? If so, let the argument which I build upon them fall to the ground. But if not so—if it must be admitted that we have here a clear instance of a Jew of Palestine addressing, among others, Jews of Palestine in the Greek language, and so well understood by them that a vast multitude repented and believed—the inference is surely manifest that Greek was then thoroughly familiar to the inhabitants of that country.

Advancing now to Chapter vii., we find ourselves upon ground which can hardly be disputed. The reasons for holding that the speech of Stephen before the Sanhedrin was delivered in Greek are very obvious and decisive. We may notice (1) that his accusers were unquestionably men to the majority of whom the Greek language only was vernacular. They consisted of Cyrenians, Alexandrians, and others (Chap. vi. 9) — foreign Jews accustomed to the use of Greek, and to whom, as a rule, Hebrew was utterly unknown. If, then, these men were present, as many of them would needs be, when St. Stephen made his defence before the Sanhedrin, the speech which he delivered must have been in Greek, else it would have been to them unintelligible. Again, (2) it is a necessary inference, from the verse which has been referred to, that Stephen was himself one who was in the habit of employing the Greek language. "There arose certain," we read, "of the

synagogue, which is called the synagogue of the Libertines, and Cyrenians, and Alexandrians, and of them of Cilicia and of Asia, disputing with Stephen." It naturally follows that, as he and they had been accustomed to dispute together in Greek, the speech which he now delivered in self-defence would also be in the Greek language. And again, (3) if we look at the address itself, we find that it bears plain evidence of having been spoken in Greek. It consists, in substance, of a cento of extracts from different parts of the Septuagint, strung together in a loose, yet masterly, manner. And nothing, surely, could be more improbable, than either that Luke adopted the version of the LXX. so often in this chapter differing from the Hebrew (see, *e.g.*, *Verses* 14 and 44), while Stephen really cited the original Scriptures; or that Stephen himself, in quoting the Hebrew, altered it as we find in the Greek version of his words. One or other of these improbabilities must be maintained by all who hold that Hebrew was employed by the proto-martyr on this occasion; and there are probably few readers who will be inclined to adopt either of the alternatives in preference to the natural conclusion reached on other grounds, that Stephen now made use of the Greek language.

Here then, again, we have a decisive case. We find that a long and important speech, addressed to the most national and distinctive of Jewish courts, was delivered in Greek. There can be no doubt that it was an *open* assembly in which Stephen now pleaded; that vast multitudes of the common people were present; that he addressed himself to them all

(*Verse* 2, ἄνδρες, ἀδελφοὶ, καὶ πατέρες); that all perfectly understood him (see *Verse* 54); and that, therefore, the inhabitants of Jerusalem in general were familiarly acquainted with the Greek language.

Turning now to Chapter xv., we once more find the clearest and most conclusive evidence in favour of the proposition sought to be established. The speeches of St. Peter and St. James before the assembly which had been convened in Jerusalem to deliberate on the point then threatening to break the peace of the Church, as well as the letter by which the mind of the council was conveyed to the disputants, may all be shewn by the most satisfactory proof to have been spoken and written in the form in which we still possess them—the Greek language. We naturally suppose, indeed, that the various speakers would make use of the same language that we have always hitherto seen them employing, and not Hebrew, the use of which would have necessitated the employment of an interpreter to some of the audience, a functionary of whom not the least trace is to be found in the narrative. And the speech of James, who seems to have spoken as president, contains positive evidence that Greek was the language employed. It includes a very remarkable citation from the Book of Amos, differing widely towards the close from the Hebrew original, but agreeing as nearly with the Septuagint as is usually the case with those *memoriter* quotations which occur so frequently in the New Testament. Now, it is quite impossible to believe that the historian would have attributed the words of the LXX. to the Apostle on this occasion, had not St. James actually employed them, since, in fact,

the weight of the argument greatly depends on that part of the citation which differs from the Hebrew text. It is therefore evident that the speech must have been delivered in the Greek language.

Again, that the epistle agreed upon by the assembly to be sent to "the brethren which are of the Gentiles in Antioch, and Syria, and Cilicia" (*Verse* 23), was written in Greek, is too plain to require any remark. No one can possibly deny it who considers either its form, which is in the regular epistolary style of the Greeks, or the persons to whom it was addressed, who are expressly described as Gentiles. The formula of salutation with which it opens (*Χαίρειν*) is the same with that contained in the letter of Claudius Lysias to Felix (Chap. xxiii. 26), occurring in the New Testament only once again in the Epistle of James; and, like both these documents, the letter in question was undoubtedly composed in the Greek language.

Once more, let me refer to the narrative contained in Chapter xxi. *Verse* 27, and the following verses. It happened that some Jews from Asia, who had, doubtless, been among the former opponents of St. Paul at Ephesus (Chap. xx. 19), were then in Jerusalem, and, seeing him in the temple, seized the opportunity of exciting the minds of the people at large against him. Laying hold of him where he stood, and evidently determined in the most summary manner to gratify the hatred which they bore him, they cried out, "Men of Israel, help: This is the man that teacheth all men everywhere against the people, and the law, and this place: and further brought Greeks also into the temple, and hath pol-

luted this holy place." Now, in what language, I would ask, was this exclamation uttered? The answer is obvious that it was in Greek. For, from whom did the words proceed? From men of Asia —inhabitants of Ephesus or the neighbourhood— persons to whom the Greek only was vernacular, and of whose knowledge of Hebrew, ancient or modern, not a tittle of evidence can be produced. It is easy, no doubt, to assume that these foreign Jews did understand and employ Aramaic. But until some proof is advanced such an assertion deserves no consideration. And I venture to maintain that no proof *can* be produced that the inhabitants of the district of Ephesus then made use of any other language than Greek. In Greek, therefore, I hold their appeal was now made to the Jewish multitude in Jerusalem. These, we find, were at once roused by the outcry of their brethren from Asia; and as it is impossible even for those writers who are fondest of the hypothesis of an interpreter on other occasions, to imagine that one was employed at this time, it follows, beyond all question, that the common people of the city, the very rabble (ὁ ὄχλος, *Verse* 27), were then perfectly familiar with the Greek language.

Objections to this conclusion, which have been derived from some passages in the Acts, will be afterwards shewn to be groundless, and to melt away, on consideration, into corroborations of the position which has already been so abundantly established.

A. ROBERTS.

ANATHEMA FROM CHRIST.

ROMANS ix. 3.

KING JAMES'S VERSION OF 1611.—"*For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh.*"

THE WRITER'S REVISED VERSION.—"*For I could wish to God to be myself accursed from the Christ, for my brethren's sake, my kinsmen according to the flesh.*"

EDITOR'S VERSION (for the benefit of those who do not read Greek). —"For I could wish to God to be myself *anathema* from the Christ, for my brethren's sake, my kinsmen according to the flesh."

THIS very solemn declaration has much "exercised" theologians, and has hence occasioned considerable perplexity to expositors. In the writer's "Exposition of the Ninth Chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans," published in 1849, he regarded the first half of the verse as parenthetical; and he thus connected directly the words of the second moiety, *for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh*, with the affirmation of the second verse, *that I have great grief and continual sorrow in my heart*. The parenthesis he translated thus (*for I myself used to wish to be accursed from the Messiah*). He looked upon the Apostle as thus referring to his own infatuation, during the time of his antagonism to Christ and Christianity, for the purpose of obliquely depicting, from the standpoint of his own experience, the lamentable spiritual condition of his countrymen, and of thus accounting for the overwhelming sorrow under which, in virtue of the genuine sympathy of his heart, he was suffering. The same interpretation, substantially, had been given to the passage by Glas, Bowyer, Wakefield, Toplady, Belsham, Rodolphus Dickinson, Walford, Craik. All of these throw the

first moiety of the verse into a parenthesis, and obliterate the full-point at the conclusion of the second verse. Wakefield's rendering of the parenthesis is (*for I also was once an alien from Christ*). Belsham's is (*for I myself once gloried in being an alien from Christ*). Tregelles seems to have taken the same view, for he encloses the first moiety of the verse in a parenthesis. Others, without the parenthetical expedient, give substantially the same interpretation. They regard the words which, in our 1849 "Exposition," we included within parenthesis, as descriptive of the Apostle's mental condition while he was yet an opponent of Christianity. But they connect the two moieties of the verse in such a way as to indicate that it was in the interest of his countrymen that he had patriotically desired to be separated, as by an awful curse, from Christ. This is Heumann's interpretation in his Monograph, and Trautmann's in his Monograph, and also Dr. Chalmers's. It would seem to have been Luther's also, and Tyndale's, and Coverdale's. The author of the Latin *Itala* had taken the same view, so far at least. He rendered the word, not potentially, but historically, *I was wishing*,[1] viz., at a former period, though not now; *I was*, viz., at a former period, *in the habit of wishing*. This translation was continued in the Vulgate, and was accepted and commented on by Ambrosiaster, Pelagius, Primasius. Ambrosiaster says, "*I was wishing*, not, *I do wish*."[2] Pelagius says, "*I was wishing*—formerly, when I was a persecutor of Christ."[3] Primasius says, "*I was wishing* formerly, not *I could*

[1] "Optabam." [2] "Optabam, non opto."
[3] "Optabam aliquando cum persequerer Christum."

now wish."[1] Wycliffe followed the Vulgate. His translation of the clause is, "Forsothe I my silf desyride for to be cursid fro Crist." The Rheims version corresponds, "For I wished myself to be anathema from Christ."

It cannot be objected to this interpretation that it attributes to the verb an unnatural or unidiomatic import; for the imperfect tense in Greek, as in Latin, naturally denotes repeated, continued, persistent, or habitual action in past time. And sometimes the reference to the particular portion of past time in which such action took place is only indirectly indicated, as when it is said, in Mark xv. 6, "Now at that feast he *released* unto them one prisoner, whomsoever they desired." The meaning is, "Now at that feast *he was wont to release* unto them one prisoner." (Comp. Matt. xxvii. 15.)

Nevertheless, even in the case of such a passage as Mark xv. 6 there is reference, though indirect, to the particular portion of past time during which the repeated action of the Roman procurator took place. It was the portion which embraced those recurrent seasons of the Passover feast which had occurred during Pilate's procuratorship. It was at *the annual festival time* that he paid the Jewish people the compliment specified. But as regards Romans ix. 3, there is no reference, beyond the verb itself, to the past as past; and, as a matter of course, there is not in the verb itself any particularization of any distinct portion of past time. There is nothing corresponding to Pelagius's interpretation, "when I was a persecutor of Christ," or even to the indefinite "once"

[1] "Optabam aliquando, non nunc optarem."

of Wakefield and Belsham. The Apostle does not speak of his "conversation" or conduct "*in time past in the Jews' religion*," when "beyond measure he persistently persecuted the church of God" (Gal. i. 13); and hence it is not likely that his statement here is, like his statement in Galatians i. 13, historical.

This unlikelihood is intensified if it be needful to assume with Tregelles, and the interpreters with whom we were at one in our 1849 "Exposition," that the first moiety of the verse constitutes a strict parenthesis. For we should never assume, especially in the case of ancient and inartificial compositions, the existence of real parentheses, unless we are shut up to the assumption.

But if—with Luther, Heumann, Trautmann, Chalmers, and, apparently too, with the author of the *Itala*, and with all the expositors who founded their interpretation on the Vulgate, such as Emanuel Sa, —the idea of a strict parenthesis be abandoned, then the unlikelihood of the historical import of the verb is increased to a still greater degree; for it is difficult to see that the fact—if fact it was—of the Apostle's former desire to be anathema from Christ for the sake of his countrymen could be the reason for the great grief and continued sorrow of which he speaks in the second verse. One would naturally suppose that it would be something in the present state of his countrymen, rather than something in his own past experience or conduct, that was rolling in upon his spirit with such overwhelming waves of sadness.

Still further, it is scarcely conceivable that the

Apostle, while yet Saul of Tarsus, wished to be "accursed from Christ." It is quite conceivable, indeed, that at that crisis of his wild fanaticism he might invoke a curse upon himself, provided he did not keep far removed in spirit "from Christ." But this is something very different from wishing himself to be "accursed," and "accursed from Christ," or "accursed in the way of being separated from Christ."

Still further. The Apostle's expression is not simply "accursed from Christ." It is far stronger,—"accursed from *the Christ*," or, "accursed from *the Messiah*." But we may rest assured that as Saul of Tarsus was both an eminently earnest and an eminently ecclesiastical man, he never did wish to be not only "accursed," but so accursed as never to have part or lot in the bliss of the Messiah's reign. We can easily conceive of him pouring contempt and hatred upon Jesus of Nazareth as a mere pretender to Messiahship, and wishing himself to be for ever far away from such a pretender. But we cannot conceive of him feeling—under any pressure, however strong, on his temper or his prejudices — the same contempt and hatred for the ideal Deliverer of his race, to whose advent he was, in common with all the pious of his people, looking longingly and eagerly forward.

Then it is to be still further noted that the best established reading of the first moiety of the verse is not that which would justify the translation given in the "Exposition" referred to,—"for I myself used to wish to be accursed from the Christ." Such a translation could be regarded as bringing out, in

alt-relief, the Apostle's former infatuation, as affording a type or specimen of the present infatuation of his unbelieving countrymen. But the collocation of the words, as given in the manuscripts ℵ A B D E F G, and approved of by Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles, and no doubt the correct order, "for I used to wish to be myself accursed from the Christ,"[1] alters entirely the point of alt-relief or intonation. In the former order the tone might be exhibited thus: *I myself, as well as they.* In the latter it stands thus: *I myself, instead of them.* In the former, the *I myself* takes precedence in intonation of the endurance of the anathema; in the latter, the endurance of the anathema takes precedence of the *I myself;* and hence the clause is no longer capable of being parenthetically descriptive of the identity of the Apostle's own past infatuation with the present infatuation of his unbelieving countrymen. The first moiety of the verse, therefore, cannot constitute a parenthesis, and this being the case, the imperfect verb cannot be translated historically, *I used to wish:* it must be rendered potentially, *I could wish.*

This potential rendering is in perfect accordance with usage, in both classical and biblical Greek. As to the latter, we have instances in Galatians iv. 20 and Acts xxv. 22. The passage in Galatians cannot be translated, as in our present King James's Version, "I *desire* to be present with you now, and to change my voice." It must be rendered, "*I could desire* (*and did circumstances permit it, I would desire, and carry out my desire*). The other passage, Acts

[1] ηὐχόμην γὰρ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι αὐτὸς ἐγὼ. The Sinaitic manuscript reads εἶναι before ἀνάθεμα. The old *Received Text* reading was ηὐχόμην γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι.

xxv. 22, runs in King James's Version thus: "I *would also hear* the man myself." It is Agrippa that speaks to Festus, and what he really says is, "I could wish, myself even, to hear the man;" or, still more idiomatically and simply, "I could wish myself to hear the man" (provided it be convenient and agreeable to thee):—"*I 'could' wish*, and, did I know that it were entirely convenient to thee, and agreeable, *I 'would' wish.*"

It is on the same principle that we are to render the verb before us, *I could desire.* The Apostle did not actually desire to be anathema. He knew that such a desire would never be divinely fulfilled, and hence he did not cherish it. A wise man keeps his desires under control. He has, indirectly, command over them. A pious man takes God's desires and purposes into account, and does not entertain any desire which he knows to be at variance with the Divine will, or with the Divine arrangements that are dependent on the Divine will. Hence it is that the Apostle does not say, *I desire;* he only says, *I could desire.* He would have been willing and wishful to be anathema for his countrymen, provided such an awful self-sacrifice had been in harmony with the will and wish of God, and thus consistent with the best interests of God's immense moral empire. So far as the Apostle himself was concerned, he was ready for the self-sacrifice, provided it should be legitimate on the one hand, and could be efficacious on the other. It would not, however, have been of avail, and hence the wish *was never fully formed.* The potential did not pass into the actual.

It is true, indeed, that the potential translation

of the verb used by the Apostle, viz., *I could wish*, though doubtless the only correct rendering that is possible in the circumstances, is nevertheless an imperfect reflection of the original "Imperfect" Tense. The idioms of the English and Greek languages are by no means identical. The potential *could* is not actually part and parcel of the Greek Imperfect Tense, although its use in English is, on the present occasion, the best expedient to which we can have recourse, to reproduce substantially the nicety of the original. The Greek Imperfect Tense is really a tense, or time, not a potency. It is a past tense, not present or future. But it is *a past tense incomplete.* It is to be carefully differentiated from a strictly "perfect" time or tense — a tense completed and complete. Hence the real idea of the word is, *I was desiring.* The desire rose up in the Apostle's heart, and to a certain extent he allowed and sanctioned it. Yet only to a certain extent, for a higher desire struck in and controlled it—the desire to be in perfect accord with God's desire and will. Hence his desire to be anathema for his countrymen never was completed and complete. It hung suspended. It remained "imperfect;" that is, it was conditional, and the condition that would have brought it to maturity was never forthcoming. Thus the embryo-desire was in reality but a potency, so that the translation *I could desire* is vindicated.

It may now still further be noticed that the word rendered *I could "wish,"* or *I could "desire,"* properly means *I could "pray."*[1] Keeling takes note of the fact,[2] and Schrader translates the verb, *I have prayed.*[3]

[1] ηὐχόμην. [2] *St. Paul's wish to be accursed from Christ*, p. 25.
[3] "Ich habe gebetet." *Der Apostel Paulus*, iv. 354.

The word is expressly rendered *pray* in 2 Corinthians xiii. 7 and James v. 16; and it really has the same meaning in 2 Corinthians xiii. 9: "This also *we wish*, even your perfection,"—"This also *we pray for*." The expression doubtless doubles back on the seventh verse, where the true reading is not, *I pray*, but, "*we pray* to God." The word occurs again in 3 John 2, where King James's translators have rendered it, *I wish;* but it really means, *I pray*. It has the same meaning also in Acts xxvii. 29, where King James's translators, following the older English Versions, have far too feebly translated thus: "Then fearing lest we should have fallen upon rocks, they cast four anchors out of the stern, and *wished for* the day." They did more than simply *wish;* they lifted up their desires to their gods, and *prayed for* the break of day. So the Syriac-Peshito correctly translates the word. The word occurs in only one other passage of the New Testament (Acts xxvi. 29), where St. Paul says to Agrippa, "*I would* to God that not only thou," &c. The expression in the original is instinct with the most gentlemanly courtesy,—*I could pray to God.* It is as if he had said, *If I might venture to use the liberty of openly expressing the fulness of my feelings, I would audibly lift up my prayer to God that not only thou, &c.* The Apostle's meaning in Romans ix. 3 would be admirably expressed in our idiomatic phrase, *I could wish to God.*

As to the word *anathema, accursed,* or *curse*, that will require a little essay of itself, by-and-by.

JAMES MORISON.

CHRIST AND THE SAMARITANS.

HE who would trace out the footprints of the Lord during his earthly ministry has not to travel far to find them. They lie for the most part along the well-beaten paths of religion and of trade, or they circle around the chief centres of Judæa and Galilee. At first sight it appears strange that He, who was the promised "seed of Abraham," who was both the "Shiloh" and "Sceptre" of Israel, who was the central vision of Jewish prophecies and the antitype of the gorgeous Hebrew ritual, should in his life pay so little heed to Jewish prejudice and tradition. Hebron, with its honoured sepulchre, is not once visited, as far as the Gospel records shew. Bethlehem, the royal city, does not appear in the Gospel narrative after the Advent, and with the sad wail of Rachel, silence falls upon the "house of bread." Carmel—home of the rugged prophet and scene of a stupendous miracle—often rose up in the vision of the Christ as it kept its solitary watch by the sea, but no footprints of the Master can we discover on its slope. Perhaps the reason for this disregard of holy sites and shrines may be found in the self-appropriated title, "Son of Man." To Jesus, Judaism is nothing but a name, a shadow. Nationality has no place in the mind of Christ, it is all given up to humanity instead; and so, while again and again He styles Himself "Son of Man," He never once calls Himself "Son of Abraham." The whole ministry of Jesus may be divided into two sections, the Galilean and Judæan. Taking Capernaum as a centre, and describing a circle with a radius of ten

miles, we shall include nearly the whole of what we may call the Galilean Gospels; while taking the Temple as a centre, and describing another circle of equal radius, we shall include nearly all of the Judæan Gospels. Between these two points the life of Christ oscillated.

Separating the two provinces was a strip of country inhabited by a mongrel semi-alien race, the Samaritan. It is not to our purpose to account for the ever-widening breach that lay between Samaritan and Jew. It is sufficient to know that the rancour of national jealousy had been embittered by the addition of the *odium theologicum*, until between the neighbouring but rival races a wide chasm had been formed which completely severed both their religious and their commercial life. The Jew scorned the Samaritan, the Samaritan hated the Jew; and in the days of Christ the Hebrew Separatist would not even accept a kindness at the hands of the despised ἀλλογενὴς. Here then is a problem, How will Christ treat this long-standing feud? Coming to correct abuses, to restore society upon another and firmer basis, what will He do with the deep abyss of prejudice which runs athwart his path? Will He pass around it, and simply ignore the strange phenomenon? Will He by word and action widen the chasm already too deep and wide? Or will He exalt the valley and bring low the mountain, that He may join the twain in one? Let us see.

1. *When Christ speaks of the Samaritans it is in words of favour and of commendation.* In St. Luke (Chap. xvii. 11–20) we have the narrative of a remarkable healing, which the other Evangelists omit.

Coming to "a certain village," a strange cry greets the Master. Over in front, some distance off, ten lepers stand. Reaching out their scaly hands, they cry aloud (ἦραν φωνὴν), "Jesus, Master, have mercy on us." Without waiting to come up to them—for the ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς must have a quick response—Jesus replies, "Go, shew yourselves unto the priests." Miraculously cleansed while passing hastily along the road, the nine stay not a moment to thank the wonderful Healer; but one returns to give glory to God, falling prostrate in his gratitude at the feet of his new-found Saviour. St. Luke tells us, laconically, "And he was a Samaritan." But Christ does more. He draws a comparison between the thankless nine and the grateful one, and turning round to his Jewish auditors, He speaks words of commendation that go resounding up into heaven, "There are not found that returned to give glory to God, save this stranger." "This stranger." What a rebuke to their national pride! As if He said, "'Stranger,' you call him, but he was co-heir of suffering and woe with your nine countrymen; and, more noble than they, he has returned to give God thanks." The Son of Man finds humanity hidden in the guise of Samaritan speech and leprous scales, and He stoops to embrace it, to exalt it. In a Samaritan He finds the truest worship of Jehovah, offered not on Moriah, nor yet on Gerizim, but by the wayside.

Another occasion when Christ is led to speak favourably of the Samaritans, is in the exquisite parable (if it be a parable) of the good Samaritan. We need not repeat the details of the hapless journey

and misadventure of the "certain man" who went down from Jerusalem to Jericho. We have again the same comparison drawn between the Samaritan and Jew, to the eternal honour of the one and the eternal shame of the other. In this case, however, the lines of comparison are made more sharp and vivid. The ten lepers occupied the same low level of physical suffering and social outlawry; but now the Samaritan is placed beside the very *élite* of Judaism, the Priest and Levite, and the Master uses their selfish inhumanity as a foil to throw out more clearly and brightly the noble generosity of the "stranger." And, by the way, how comes the Samaritan here, in the dangerous defile near the Jordan? True, the necessities of business might call him thither, but it almost seems a going out of the way—an *anatopism*, if we might call it so—to set down the Samaritan so far from the ordinary routes of Samaritan travel. But it serves the Master's purpose. He has answered the broad question, "Who is my neighbour?" and at the same time He has lifted out of the mire a name which for long centuries has been trodden under foot of prejudice and pride. Henceforth through the ages mankind awards its praise and lavishes its admiration, not upon the Priest- or Levite-Jew, the heartless hirelings of the Temple, but upon the anonymous "stranger," who sacrifices oil, and wine, and money, nay, even himself, to the need and misfortune of a beaten deserted foreigner.[1]

Nowhere else—except in one instance which we shall notice shortly—do we find amongst the words

[1] His nationality is implied in the narrative.

of Christ any mention of the Samaritans; but among his unrecorded sayings there were doubtless many references to the outcast race. Indeed, in one place we find the Jews charging Him with being Himself a Samaritan (John viii. 48). True, the Rabbis tell us this expression was often used as a by-word of reproach and anger, but in this case it is something more than a taunt flung red-hot from the hasty lips of Passion. It assumes the nature of a deliberate charge. What was a mere whisper has passed into a common rumour; and the rumour, rolled on from mouth to mouth, has grown, like a man of snow, into solidity and shape. It is no longer the hasty taunt, but the summing-up of what was common conversation among them. "*Say we not well* that thou art a Samaritan, and hast a devil?" And why should they speak thus? Surely not because they are in doubt as to his nationality, for it was well known that He came forth from Galilee, from Nazareth. But it might be—may we not say it *must* be?—because of his strong Samaritan leanings. He has visited them, has often spoken of them, has held them up to their gaze; and that, not as the refuse of humanity, fit only for the Gehenna of perdition, but as models for their imitation. This is the vinegar which sets their teeth on such rough edge, and makes their lips speak in caustic rasping words. And, by the way, it is worth a passing note how Jesus replies to the double accusation. The second charge, "Thou hast a devil," He answers with a solemn οὐκ ἔχω: but to the former charge, "Thou art a Samaritan," He deigns no reply, He answers only by an eloquent silence.

2. *Christ seeks to remove the prejudice of his dis-*

ciples by personal contact with the despised race. In the commission given to the Twelve we find one command that seems to run contrary to the whole drift of Christ's teaching and example. He tells them, "Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not" (Matt. x. 5). What means this exception to the general rule of Christ's words, and to the general tenour of his life? The reason lies not far off. The disciples are yet men of narrow views; the angles of their sharp prejudices have not yet been worn down by friction with the outer world. What right (to their mind) have the Gerizim idolaters to the privileges of this new kingdom when David's throne is rebuilt upon the ruins of a Cæsar's? How can the Galilean fishermen chaunt the Bethlehem refrain, "Good will toward men," when they are ready to call down upon those who slight them the swift avenging fire from heaven? Here, then, is the reason, and the only one. The disciples themselves are lacking in the essential qualifications for a Samaritan ministry. Their dreams of earthly aggrandizement must be laid aside; ambition must give place to love; their bigotries must be plucked up by the root and burned in the fire of Pentecost; their sympathies must be broadened and deepened; from the Son of Man they must learn the lesson of humanity, before they can thrust their sickles into the harvests that wave and whiten upon Samaritan fields. Till then the Saviour's command is but the language of Infinite Wisdom, where insight ripens into foresight.

And how does Jesus discipline his followers, and tone down their rough prejudices? By bringing

them into personal contact with the Samaritans. In St. John (Chap. iv. 4) we have a somewhat singular expression. They are about to make the journey from Jerusalem to Galilee, and the Evangelist inserts a brief sentence which is itself the key of the whole chapter: "And he must needs go through Samaria." Now why was this ἔδει — this needs-be? Was it because this was the only possible route? Nay, there were at least three roads leading from Jerusalem to Galilee: one veering to the west, and joining the main caravan-road along by the sea; another striking eastward, and passing Jericho up by the *ghor* of the Jordan; while the third led northward by Bethel and Sychar. Although the third route was most direct, the others were frequently taken. Indeed, the Jordan road was often chosen in preference by the Jews, just for the sake of evading intercourse with the hated Samaritans; and once at least the Lord led his disciples up to Jerusalem by way of Jericho (St. Luke xix). It was not therefore any topographical needs-be that now compelled the Saviour to take the northern route. It was rather the necessity of some hidden purpose lying deep in the mind of Christ, a purpose we may read in the expanded details of the journey. He leads his disciples through the heart of the alien country. By Jacob's well, by Joseph's sepulchre, by Gerizim with its blessings and by Ebal with its heavy curses, He reminds them of their common origin, how Samaritans and Jews are fellow-heirs of a glorious history. But more. He sends them to do business with the men of Sychar, to "buy meat." He brings them face to face, voice to voice, that they may recognize their common brother-

hood; that in the exchange of commodities and coins there may be a softening of prejudice, with all the enlightenment of a nearer vision and closer intercourse. Yea, more; He puts around his disciples the bonds of guesthood: for when the dream of the Messiah dawns upon the Samaritan mind, and they believe upon Christ, they cannot allow the new Sun which has appeared in their heavens to pass away with the daylight. They pressed around Christ, and "besought[1] him that he would tarry with them" (*Verse* 40); and we read, "He abode there two days." The narrative is silent as to what occurred during the two memorable days of the sojourn at Sychar. We are simply told that many more were led through his persuasive and convincing word to accept Him as ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου, "the Saviour of the world," a higher title than the disciples even have as yet given the Lord.[2] Still we may easily fill up the picture drawn in outline to our hand. There would be, doubtless, a rivalry of proffered hospitality, and nowhere in the land would Christ and his disciples be more welcome guests than in this city. "Friend of publicans and sinners," did He find a home beneath the sin-stained roof of the nameless repentant one? From *this* desecrated temple did He drive forth the dark wings of lust and sin by the glorious light of his presence and his love, making it thus a fit abode for a new, a pure faith? We

[1] The ἠρώτων implies continued action; "they kept on asking," as if they would take no denial.

[2] Only once before has the title Σωτὴρ been applied to Christ, and that was in the angel-song at Bethlehem. The hills of Samaria thus give us the first echo of that song, and while the disciples yet look upon Christ as the Restorer of Israel, Samaria's faith outstrips them, and lays the "world" at the feet of Christ.

may only guess the answer. But where are the disciples? They are brought into close contact with the "strangers," they converse with them, they seal the contract of friendship by eating bread with them, they sleep on couches spread by Samaritan hands; and, lo! their sleep is just as sweet as if they lay within the shadow of the Temple walls, or as if they were lulled to rest by the soft-lapping waves of their own Gennesareth. The old prejudice is removed, the icy reserve is thawed out in the warmth and glow of friendly courtesies; and as they go out after the two days' sojourn, they carry with them a bright memory and a broadened charity.

3. *Christ offered to the Samaritans the privileges of his kingdom.* We need not repeat the familiar story, how Jesus sat wearied by the well; nor need we draw out the many lessons of the noontide conversation. How natural and cautious is his approach! How, little by little, He lets the light fall upon the eyes, and down into the shadowed heart of the Samaritan sinner! How He pursues the soul, and drives it from one refuge to another, until, like Noah's dove, it flies panting and weary to the Ark! With what calm majesty He replies to her light and flippant speech![1] And how at last He breaks upon her ear the wonderful secret of his Messiahship![2] To win the erring spirit to purity and to faith, He steps over the line of Jewish conventionality; He deigns to speak to, and to ask a favour from, a Samaritan woman. In her ears He speaks one of the sub-

[1] The λαλιάν of *Verse* 42 is, perhaps, a key-word to her character. There is more speech than reason, more word than wit. It is the φωνή rather than the λόγος. See Alford *in loco*.

[2] It is the ἐγώ εἰμι, the I AM of the New Dispensation.

limest discourses of his ministry; and now, hard by the mount where the Law's benedictions fell, there comes another blessing, the crowning one of all, the confession of his Messiahship. Nor does the work stop here, for many of the Samaritans find in Jesus the fulfilment of their long-deferred hopes, the "prophet like unto Moses." They recognize in Him the Shiloh of their "father Jacob," and they lay the homage of their hearts down at the feet of David's Son, the Saviour, the Christ!

And what is the result of all this? Why, the chasm is filled up; the estrangement of centuries is reconciled; Judæa and Samaria are joined in one by the double ties of nationality and humanity. And as we pass beyond the cross and the tomb, we hear the last charge falling from the lips of Christ: "Ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judæa, *and in Samaria*, and unto the uttermost part of the earth" (Acts i. 8). "To the Jew first," as is befitting, the promises of the Gospel must come; but Samaria must occupy the second place. And so, after the first baptism of Pentecost, and the second baptism of blood, we read, "Then Philip went down to the city of Samaria,[1] and preached Christ unto them" (Acts viii. 5).

At length the prayer is answered, and into the fields "white unto harvest" the labourers come to reap and to rejoice, for "there was great joy in that city" (Acts viii. 8). And then we see Peter and John—the very John who would fain have called down fire upon them before—coming along the familiar road, where each hill and valley reminds them of Him who

[1] Probably Sychar. Comp. the εἰς πόλιν τῆς Σαμαρείας of St. John iv. 5.

has vanished into heaven, to lay hands upon the Samaritan converts, and to build up the first Christian Church outside Jerusalem. Henceforth, to the Christian heart, the Samaritan is no more the "stranger," but a "fellow-citizen with the saints, and of the household of God." HENRY BURTON.

THE HOLINESS OF JESUS CHRIST.

II. BUT would it therefore be true to say that, in realizing in this manner the perfect holiness of Jesus Christ, we break the link which binds Him to our humanity, and that this character, which raises Him to such a height in our eyes, is gained at the cost of another more precious still to our hearts; that so He would cease to be like us, our Brother, the Son of Man, in the full meaning of that expression?

By no means, for this holiness, however absolutely perfect, has, none the less, characteristics perfectly human, and which clearly distinguish it from the holiness of God.

1. The holiness of God is unchangeable, it cannot grow. Like God Himself, it *is*. That of Jesus rose step by step till it reached its final perfection. Is it not said of Him as a child, and again as a young man, that He "increased in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man"? This development was not merely in appearance; it was a profound moral reality, since it is said that this progress was accomplished not in the eyes of man only, but of God.

Perhaps you think that this idea of progress implies the fact of sin? Not so; it is possible to grow

in pure goodness, to climb, like the angels, without ever stumbling, the steps of the ladder of light which leads upwards to Divine glory. Thus it was that Jesus advanced in goodness. He took possession, in the name of his Father, of all the provinces of human life which opened successively before Him; in the beginning, of that of the family, which was the first which offered itself to Him, and which He embraced in his loving heart, watering it in his childhood with his prayers and intercessions; next,—of that period in youth when the sentiments of patriotism begin to shew themselves in a young and noble heart,—of his own nation, which to Him was altogether like his own family. From that time the determination to labour at realizing the great promises of which it was the object became his heart's vocation. Finally, at the age of thirty years, at the time of his baptism, having then reached the full maturity of his powers, He saw opening before Him a domain wider still. The world itself was the field which He felt Himself called upon to cultivate by his words, to water with his blood, and to fertilize for the glory of God by his spirit.

Thus did love grow, and thus did devotion increase, in the heart of Jesus, but without the existence in it of any germ of hatred to be extirpated, or of any selfish tendency to be repressed. To open his heart with growing sympathy to the ever-increasing number of the creatures whom his Father gave Him to love, until at last He felt that the whole human race was laid upon his heart, and that He had become Himself its living centre—this was the nature of his progress; a pro-

gress of the most real and positive kind, of which the final stage was marked by that name, *Son of Man*, which He adopted as his favourite title, and which He drew from out of that inward feeling of tenderest sympathy for the human race which He had made his family.

As the task He had to fulfil with regard to mankind became more and more clear to his inward eye, so did He devote his whole life and person more and more exclusively to it; and this is a second aspect of the progress which was to work itself out within Him. Jesus, in his last prayer, uttered those remarkable words which no forger—and certainly no forger putting arbitrarily into the mouth of his hero the theory of the Logos—would have attributed to Him, "For their sakes I sanctify myself." [1] How, it has often been asked, could He have been called upon to sanctify Himself, if He was not stained with sin? The answer is that to sanctify does not mean to *purify*, but to *consecrate*. *Holy* is not opposed to *impure*, but to *profane*, common, not sacred, natural. Jesus sanctified Himself by offering to God step by step all the elements of his being, as they gradually developed themselves within Him; all the powers of his body and soul, as they one by one came into play; and all the varied domains of existence, as He came to set his foot upon them.

In childhood, no doubt, He played; for "as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same. . . . He was in all points like as we are, yet without sin." [2] Now play, without being impure, is nevertheless not precisely

[1] John xviii. 19. [2] Heb. ii. 14, 17; iv. 15.

a holy thing. It belongs to that province of the *natural* which interposes itself at the beginning of our life between those of sin and holiness. Later on, play disappeared from the life of Jesus, as it generally disappears from the life of every serious man, in proportion as the great work of life comes upon him.

This is an instance of the way in which all the activities of nature, all the physical and moral forces, ranged themselves by degrees in Jesus in subordination to the task to which He was growing up, and received in succession, in virtue of that free consecration, the seal of holiness. It was by means of these continual and freely chosen acts of self-control (*I sanctify myself*) that He became, in the full meaning of the word, the *Holy One of God.*

In this holiness of Jesus everything is, if you will, Divine, in the sense that it is perpetually drawn afresh from God, the alone good. But everything is human, nevertheless, in the sense that that communion with God, which was its principle, was by Jesus entered upon, and sustained, by acts of free will. In himself, and apart from the Fall, every man would have been able to develop himself in the same manner.

2. The holiness of Jesus was human, not only because it obeyed the law of progress, but also because it submitted itself to a law of far graver character—that of temptation and conflict.

Conflict has no place in God. "God cannot be tempted with evil." Jesus had to fight. The wilderness and Gethsemane—here are two battle-fields which the Church will not forget, and which were

watered with his sweat. Nor were these the only ones.[1]

The question has been asked how it was possible for Jesus to be tempted, to go through a conflict, if He was without sin. Do you then know of no other moral conflicts but such as spring from sin? I will suppose you have a taste for study, and delight in science. But, being the eldest brother, and having lost your parents, you have brothers and sisters to bring up. You are compelled to lay aside your books, and, by work of quite a different kind, earn a living for those whom Providence has entrusted to your care. There is a conflict in your case, not between good and evil, but between a lower kind of good—science, and a higher kind—duty. Or, you are devoted to art, and you give yourself wholly to the cultivation of the fine faculties with which you have been endowed. But your country being in danger, demands help from the strong arms of her children. The sound of her cry of distress reaches you in the foreign land where you are losing yourself in the pursuit of the beautiful. You are called to leave the scene of your artistic labours, and to hasten to the scene of war. Is there not a conflict here—not between good and evil, but between two kinds of good which occupy different steps on the ascending hierarchies of morality?

It is in this sense that Jesus, though without sin, was capable of exposure to temptation. He possessed instincts the most generous, faculties the most eminent. As a philosopher, He would have surpassed Socrates; as an orator, He would have

[1] *Cf.* Luke xii. 50; John xii. 27.

eclipsed Demosthenes. The substance as well as the form of his teaching prove that. He had a heart capable, above all others, of delighting itself in the tenderness of family affection; and as an organ of the high inspirations of patriotism, none could have been found more heroic than He, had He been permitted to surrender Himself to them. We have but to recal his last words to his mother and to his disciple, and his tears over Jerusalem on the day of his own triumph! He had to check all these innocent instincts, to repress these noble impulses, to sacrifice these legitimate pleasures, in order to give Himself up altogether to the task assigned to Him from above—to his work as the Redeemer; in Himself setting before his Church an example of what was meant by those expressions—to cut off the right hand, to pluck out the right eye, to lose one's life in order to find it. After our likeness, too, He was capable of physical suffering, of undergoing the sharp pangs and rendings of the heart. Out of zeal for his mediatorial work He had to accept all the sufferings against which our flesh and our heart most legitimately rebel. But every time this submission cost Him a struggle. We see it plainly enough at Gethsemane. Thus, as it is said in that admirable Epistle to the Hebrews, He was *made perfect*, and He *learned obedience* by the things which He suffered.[1]

Progress and conflict, Are not these the characteristics of a holiness truly human? In the wilderness, at Gethsemane, it may well indeed be said we are in

[1] Heb. ii. 10; v. 8, 9. No other book in the New Testament brings out with such force, by the side of the divinity of Jesus Christ (Chap. i.), his perfect humanity (Chaps. ii. and v.).

the ante-chambers of Heaven, but assuredly we are not yet in Heaven itself.

III. And this is just the reason why the holiness of Jesus, perfect as it is, is yet within the reach of man, and of every believer who aspires to it; though not indeed *apart from* Him and in a way parallel to his, as the freethinkers imagine, who deem that to set Jesus before them as their model is enough to enable them at once to imitate Him. No, the distance between Him and us is too great for the work of our sanctification to be accomplished in the same way as his. It must be worked in us *by* his.

There is in us that germ of sin which, as we have seen, did not exist in Him. He had but to learn; we have, not only to learn, but also to *unlearn*, if we may use the expression. He had but to grow; we have to grow and to decrease at the same time. He had but to fill his heart with God; we have, at the same time that we so fill ours, to empty it of ourselves.

This twofold work is beyond the moral strength of man; that is a fact which every man who seriously sets himself to it will ere long be brought to acknowledge. It is necessary, then, that the holiness of Jesus should become to us more than a mere model to imitate. It is necessary that that holiness which He realized freely in his own person, in our human existence, should become *our own*. Did not He say, "For their sakes I sanctify myself, *that they also might be sanctified through the truth*"?[1] When He sanctified Himself, it was human life, it was mankind altogether, that He was sanctifying. By

[1] John xvii. 19,

continually preventing the birth of sin in his own person, He was condemning it to destruction in our own. He was proving that sin is an *intruder* in human nature, and was planting within the consciousness of men the feeling of the possibility and therefore of the duty of expelling it. It was by his life, which was human, but at the same time pure and holy, free from all stain, and wholly devoted to God, that He contradicted sin and set up the kingdom of holiness, that is, of God, upon this polluted earth.

But in order that this kingdom may extend itself, it is necessary that that holiness which is its essence should be communicated from its King to his subjects. This communication presupposes a bridge of connection between the two, which is described by Jesus in these words, "I am the vine, ye are the branches."[1] It was by his ascension that He acquired the power to establish this connection, and it was at Pentecost that He established it in fact.

The pure sap which filled the vine was to enter into the branches and to take the place of the poisoned sap which was circulating in such abundance within them. Through his exaltation to the right hand of God,—which means into the mode of existence of God Himself, the state of Omnipresence, Omniscience, Omnipotence,—Jesus received the power to enter, Himself, into the hearts of believers, to make his abode there, and to reproduce in them that same perfected humanity which He had realized in his own person. Associated with the sovereign power of God, He dispenses the Holy Spirit, and can by his co-operation reproduce all the features of his moral physiognomy in believers.

[1] John xv. 5.

You know that art—one of the most marvellous discoveries of our time—by means of which we have all become painters of as great ability as the most consummate artist: our form, reproducing itself in all its subtlest details upon the plate prepared for the purpose, may be multiplied in a thousand copies, each an exact *facsimile* of the original prototype. It even succeeds in imparting to them something of the life which animates it. Just so, through the power of the Spirit, does Christ reproduce Himself in the heart and in the life of believers. If we place ourselves assiduously before Him, in a mood of concentrated devotion, that Holy Spirit, through whom He offered Himself to God without spot,[1] imprints, like the ray of light upon ourselves, the characteristic features of the model which we are contemplating; He Himself lives in us. So had He promised, "He shall glorify me in you;"[2] and St. Paul affirms the same truth in those words which sum up his sublimest experiences, "We all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord."[3]

Under such conditions it is possible for us to enter successfully upon the great work of our moral renewal, and to set out upon that path of holiness which ascends to heaven, without fear of succumbing under its difficulties in the midst of the journey, or even in the first and lowest steps of the upward progress.

By his death, Christ our righteousness and our peace; by his life on earth and in heaven, Christ our sanctification and our strength:—this is the

[1] Heb. ix. 14. [2] John xvi. 14. [3] 2 Cor. iii. 18.

salvation offered to the human soul. To receive Christ in this twofold character, by the energetic receptivity of faith, is what Jesus calls, in his symbolic way of speaking, "eating his flesh and drinking his blood;" and you all know that it is to these two acts united that He has Himself attached the possession of life.[1]

F. GODET.

NOTES ON COMMENTARIES.

6.—THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

IN the last number of THE EXPOSITOR I promised to give some account of Mr. Lewin's "Life and Epistles of St. Paul," to which I referred as less known, but not less deserving to be known, than Conybeare and Howson's work of the same title. I have pleasure in redeeming that promise, both because the book is one which I have found useful, and because a new, enlarged, and most sumptuous edition of it has recently appeared, with the merits of which all students of the Bible ought to be acquainted. Mr. Lewin commenced his work, I believe, before Messrs. Conybeare and Howson commenced theirs, and issued his book complete when not more than half of theirs had been printed. This simultaneous, or nearly simultaneous, production of two elaborate works on the career and writings of St. Paul was the more singular from the fact that the two works are built on very much the same lines, have a similar aim, and pursue it in a similar method. Any one who has the quarto edition of Conybeare and Howson, but not that of Mr. Lewin,

[1] John vi. 53, 54.

may form a tolerably accurate conception of what the latter work is like, if he imagines what the former would have been had it been written by a learned and religious layman some twenty years later, had it also been still more lavishly illustrated and adorned.

The quarto is not however its earliest form. In the first edition (1851) it consisted of two somewhat dumpy octavos, adorned with no illustrations but a map and a few poorly-drawn plans. It was in this form that it grew familiar to my hands, and that I worked with it some ten or twelve years. In this case familiarity has only bred liking and esteem. Perhaps, indeed, love and long use put me in some danger of overrating it. But a man can only speak of a book, as of all things else, as he finds it; and I have long found this book a most friendly and helpful companion.

I doubt, indeed, whether I shall ever take to the quartos as kindly as to the octavos, for large and handsome quartos are heavy and awkward to use. But I must admit that, in every other respect, the new edition is an immense improvement on the old. For one thing, the whole work has been carefully rewritten, rewritten from the most modern point of view, and with all the advantage not only of the most recent discoveries of criticism and research, but also of Mr. Lewin's studies of Biblical chronology — studies of which he has given us the results in his "Fasti Sacri." It is impossible, indeed, so much as to glance through these noble quartos without perceiving that the author has made his labour "a labour of love," one might almost say his "hobby," during the quarter of a century which has elapsed

since the first edition of it appeared. It is crowded with costly and beautiful illustrations, swept now and then from the most unlikely quarters. Whatever can throw light on the Apostle's career is pressed into the service, and even much that does not relate immediately to him, but helps to body forth the time in which he lived. All that history, literature, criticism, ruins, monuments, inscriptions, pictures, statues, charts, medallions, coins, gems, &c., can do to set forth the man and his time, may be found here. And these abundant, and well-nigh redundant, illustrations, which it must have taken the best part of a lifetime to collect, are used with a certain ease and mastery which shew that the author has studied every branch of his subject.

I have said that, in the new edition, the whole work is recast. And by that I do not mean simply that it has been revised; but that every paragraph has been rewritten, and almost every sentence. Much is added, much amended, a little omitted. By noting the omissions, corrections, additions, of only the first chapter of the work, I may at once mark the great superiority of this recent edition, and give the reader some notion of its quality.

Of omissions, perhaps the most remarkable is that of a very naïve and amusingly absurd piece of exegesis on page 6 of the earlier edition, which, standing so early in the book, may have led some Biblical scholars to underrate its value.

"Saul was, perhaps, the only son, but there was certainly a sister, who afterwards married and settled at Jerusalem, and was the mother of a family. *We should even surmise that there was still another sister,*

for in the First Epistle to the Corinthians we read, 'Have we not power to lead about a sister?' a remark which could scarcely have reference to one then a matron, and whose superintendence of a household would necessarily preclude her from accompanying the wanderings of a homeless brother."

Happily all this is banished from the new edition, and the reader no longer trips over this stone of offence at the very outset of his journey. The corrections and amendments of this Chapter are mostly chronological, and shew that Mr. Lewin's "Fasti Sacri" studies have borne fruit. Whenever a date is needed, it is given, and thus the whole narrative is, as it were, hooped together. Not only so; but, on reconsideration, he has seriously changed his chronology of the Apostle's whole life. Thus, for example, in the earlier edition we were told that Saul commenced his studies in Jerusalem "at an early age, *perhaps at about twelve or thirteen*," and "passed *the next seventeen years* of his life at the Jewish capital;" whereas, in the new edition, we are told that he probably commenced his studies in the schools of Jerusalem "*at about ten*," and "passed *the next quarter of a century* at the Jewish capital."

These corrections are valuable, and shew that the author has reconsidered every minute point in his subject, as well as rewritten his book. But it is in the many, and sometimes large, additions he has made to it that the great value of the new edition consists. We have a specimen of them so early as on page 4, where, in the discussion on the probable modes in which the father of Saul obtained the Roman franchise, even "the most feasible hypothesis" is new.

"Perhaps the most feasible of all hypotheses is, that the Roman franchise was conferred on the father, or some ancestor, of Saul as a reward for distinguished services to the Roman state; not indeed for military prowess in the field, as a rigid Jew could not conscientiously enlist in the Roman army, but for some exertion of his personal influence in favour of Octavius and Anthony, in their struggle against Brutus and Cassius. No city was more deeply involved in the intrigues of the day, or saw greater vicissitudes in consequence, than Tarsus; and the father, or ancestor, of Saul, as a wealthy burgess, may have been fortunate enough to side with the faction which eventually triumphed, and may then have reaped the reward of his zeal, and perhaps also of his sufferings, by receiving the diploma[1] of the Roman citizenship."

On page 6 we have at once a correction and an addition. In the first edition Mr. Lewin fixed the date of St. Paul's birth at A.D. 6; now he fixes it at A.D. 2, and he justifies his preference of the new date in a long and valuable note (too long to quote), full of erudition, a piece of work such as a workman loves, in which much thought and labour are disguised under an animated and flowing style.

On pages 10 and 11 we have an instructive passage on the traces of Rabbinical culture in the style of the Apostle, followed by a paragraph on his knowledge of Roman law which appears only in the later edition. After conducting Saul to the school of Gamaliel, where he was a fellow-student of Bar-

[1] See THE EXPOSITOR, vol. i. p. 294, *et seq.*

nabas, whom he had before encountered at Tarsus, Mr. Lewin continues:—

"Saul now rapidly advanced in the study of the Law—that is, of the Jewish Scriptures and Traditions—or (as he expresses it himself), he was 'taught according to the perfect manner of the Law of the fathers.'[1] That he was intimately conversant with Holy Writ is attested by the readiness of his quotations and the felicity of their application. We may also trace in his writings the peculiar system adopted in the schools of Jerusalem for the instruction of the students. Questions were propounded, and then debated by the disputants, in the form of dialogue; arguments were urged, and objections were suddenly interposed and answered. This will account for the abrupt style so familiar to the reader: 'What advantage then hath the Jew? or what profit is there of circumcision?'[2] 'What then? are we better than they?'[3] 'What shall we say then that Abraham our father, as pertaining to the flesh, hath found?'[4] 'What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound?'[5] 'What then? shall we sin, because we are not under the law, but under grace?'[6] 'What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with God?'[7] and examples of the like kind might be multiplied without end. We also discover in his writings occasional allusions to the traditions of the Fathers, to which the learned doctors of the school of Hillel attached so much importance. Thus, we are startled by the mention of Jannes and Jambres, the names of the Egyptian sorcerers who

[1] Acts xxii. 3. [2] Rom. iii. 1. [3] Ibid. iii. 9. [4] Ibid. iv. 1. [5] Ibid. vi. 1. [6] Ibid. vi. 15. [7] Ibid. ix. 14.

withstood Moses.[1] In other places we are reminded of the mystical and hidden meanings to which the Jewish divines had recourse in their interpretation of Scripture. For instance, Hagar and Sarah, the bondwoman and the freewoman, are, in an allegory, to signify the servitude of the Law and the liberty of the Gospel.[2] We must remark, however, that the strength of Saul's mind enabled him to avoid the puerile conceits and idle fancies by which the Jewish commentaries were disfigured and rendered ridiculous.

"Saul, both as a scribe and a Roman citizen, would necessarily devote some portion of his time to the study of *foreign* law, and more particularly that of Rome. It excites no surprise that, at Philippi, he should extort from the Roman Duumviri, or Prætors, a confession that they had broken the law under which they lived;[3] or that he should have cautioned the officer about to put him to the torture, that, as a Roman citizen, he was exempt from the rack;[4] or that he should have pleaded his own cause before Felix and Festus, and, as a Roman citizen, have exercised the right of appeal to the Emperor, and then have made his own defence before the highest tribunals at Rome."[5]

Another valuable addition is made, on pages 12 and 13, to the proofs given in the previous edition of St. Paul's familiarity with the literatures and philosophies of Greece and Rome. After noting his keen relish for the beauties of the Greek poets and dramatists, our author proceeds to urge:—

[1] 2 Tim. iii. 8. [2] Gal. iv. 21. [3] Acts xvi. 37.
[4] Ibid xxii. 25. [5] 2 Tim. iv. 16.

"That Saul had an intimate acquaintance with the Greek writings of his countryman Philo, is manifest from the close proximity of the language of the Apostle to that of the Alexandrian philosopher. The thoughts and phrases, more particularly in the Epistle to the Hebrews,[1] are identical. Indeed, the contemplative turn of Saul's mind would lead him naturally to study the philosophy of the Greeks generally. At Athens he encountered the Stoics and Epicureans, and they would hardly have condescended to discuss such high matters with him, had he not been capable of doing battle with them on their own ground. He must, therefore, have been familiar with the doctrines of both schools, and his religious cast of thought would incline him to the Stoics rather than the Epicureans. Thus, in his address to the Areopagus, we find him echoing the noblest sentiments of the Stoic philosophy. We can also thus account for the great resemblance between the language of Saul and that of Seneca, a Stoic philosopher. The explanation commonly offered is that Saul became acquainted with Gallio, the brother of Seneca, and, as a prisoner, was confided to the care of Burrhus, the captain of the prætorians, and the friend of Seneca; and that he thus became intimate with Seneca himself, and that each borrowed the thoughts of the other. But the truer solution is that both had studied the learning of the same school of philosophy, and that the minds of both were deeply tinged with the colour of their early lucubrations."

[1] This attribution of the Epistle to the Hebrews to the Apostle Paul shews that Mr. Lewin is not quite sound in the critical faith. But it must not be assumed that he has not weighed the arguments on the other side. Proof to the contrary is to be found in vol. ii. chap. 7.

The discussion of St. Paul's Hebrew culture is expanded in the same way. In the original edition Mr. Lewin assumed as a matter of course—and the assumption is probable almost to certainty—that Saul had taken the degree of Rab in the Jewish schools, "the first step to honour amongst his countrymen," and had then proceeded to the higher grades of Rabbi, "the second step." Now he adds :—

"The diploma of Rabbi, conferred by the university of Jerusalem, was of the greatest service to Saul in his subsequent labours; for it enabled him to address his countrymen in the synagogues abroad, and to command, from his rank, their respectful attention. The grade of Rabbi was, it has been thought, denoted by some external badge, and, according to Lightfoot, by the breadth of the phylacteries ;[1] and if so, it would account for the readiness with which Saul was everywhere received among his countrymen, until the peculiarity of his doctrines provoked antagonism."[2]

I have only to add that the Chapter closes with two pedigrees, not contained in the former edition, one of the family of the Cæsars, and the other of the family of the Herods; and that this first Chapter may be taken as a fair specimen, both of the whole of this erudite and valuable work, and of the immense superiority of the recent over the original edition of it. EDITOR.

[1] See Biscoe on the Acts, c. 7. [2] Ibid.

SIMON AND THE SINNER.

ST. LUKE vii. 36–50.

THIS was the only occasion that we know of on which our Lord was asked to dinner by a man of Simon's class. It was their common cry against Him that He ate with publicans and sinners; that He affected no exclusiveness, religious or social (or both), such as formed in their eyes a most important element in life. It does not however appear that they gave Him much chance of shewing better taste in the matter. While He was gladly welcomed in pious unpretentious homes, like that of Bethany, and while He was often invited by rich and (presumably) vulgar publicans, who were attracted by his kindly and gracious behaviour to them, He was outside the pale of the Pharisees' social consideration, as of their religious sympathy. What it was that probably induced Simon to depart from the usual custom of his order in this case we shall see presently. That he ventured upon the step at all is an incidental proof that it happened early in our Lord's ministry, and that it is rightly placed by the Evangelist in this early chapter of his Gospel: later on in our Lord's career no Pharisee would have dared to invite Him openly to his house.

In *Verse* 37 we are met by one of the most curious and interesting questions of the Gospel story. Who was this "woman in the city"? With a singular consent, Christian antiquity,[1] Christian poetry, Christian art, replies myriad-tongued, "It was Mary Magdalene; it was she out of whom seven devils were cast; it was she who stood at the foot of the cross and at the sepulchre, weeping." And, further, with

[1] At least from the time of Gregory the Great.

less of unanimity they reply, "It was Mary the sister of Lazarus." The one argument which supports this latter identification is apparent. St. John says plainly, in speaking of Mary of Bethany, "It was that Mary which anointed the Lord with ointment, and wiped his feet with her hair." Now it must be confessed that the use of a past tense (first aorist) here would be strong evidence, by itself, that St. John was referring to some past anointing familiar to his readers from other sources. But the only anointing mentioned in the two first Gospels is clearly the same with that *subsequently* recorded by St. John. What remains then but to identify the Mary of St. John xi. 2 with the woman of St. Luke vii. 37? Thus there does appear from the text itself some reason (though not sufficient reason) for supposing that this sinner was actually the sister of Lazarus.

Much more curious is her popular identification with Mary Magdalene, because it is due not to anything in the text of Scripture, but to a sentiment—a sentiment which seems to have been universal, which is certainly true and beautiful in itself, but which has led to the confounding of two utterly distinct characters. That Mary Magdalene was one out of whom seven devils had been cast, is to *us*, with our keen perception of the physical characteristics of "possession," proof positive that she was not the same as the pardoned harlot, that her very misfortune had made such a life impossible. That she was so generally believed to be the same shews how soon the typical and (so to speak) evangelical aspect of the casting out of devils obscured the literal; how instinctively the dispossession of these evil spirits came to be re-

garded as the symbol of our deliverance from the thraldom of lusts and passions. Believing, as I do, that our Lord's miracles are (to us) but so many acted parables, I cannot but feel that there was a certain truth in the instinct which recognized in the Magdalene out of whom seven devils had gone the woman who had been rescued from a life of sin.

But even more potent in forming the legend of the "Magdalene" were those passages which speak of her as standing by the cross and watching by the grave. Where should the sinful woman—sinful no longer, but loving so much, because so much forgiven—where should she be found *but* beneath the cross, beside the tomb? This is surely a true instinct: it is no careless error. Is there among those "holy women" one that is foremost and most absorbed in her passionate devotion? It must be she who was not holy once, who owes it all to Him that she is holy now. True in itself (though mistaken in the particular instance) to Christian experience, as to art and poetry, is the instinct which recognized and hailed the woman that was a sinner in the disconsolate mourner to whom Christ first appeared from the dead: true to the spirit of the gospel was the wish to yield this precedence to the pardoned harlot, to place this crown of favour upon the head of penitence. I almost feel it is a sorry triumph of the dry light of a more critical exegesis to have exploded this mistake, so fruitful has it been of beautiful thoughts and beautiful pictures.[1]

[1] As a landmark in the history of this legend, it is worth noticing that the first reformed Prayer-book of Edward VI. had a Collect, Epistle, and Gospel for "St. Mary Magdalene," founded on this identification. These were omitted from the second book in consequence of the doubts which arose on the historical question.

If this, however, be a doubtful gain, it is quite otherwise, as it seems to me, with the confusion between the harlot and Mary of Bethany. One must surely have lost all perception of what is true to woman's nature to tolerate the idea that the sister of Lazarus, who had nothing of the passion, nothing of the self-consciousness, of the penitent about her, could have been such an one as the woman in the city. The serenity and quiet piety of that home, as pictured by St. John, and the esteem in which the sisters were held by "the Jews" at the time of their brother's death, make it certain that it never had been the scene of so terrible an upheaval as the fall of the younger sister would have caused. And still more hardly could we imagine that, if she had been such, it would have been written that Jesus "loved Martha, *and her sister*, and Lazarus." God forbid that we should derogate ought from the exceeding love with which He both forestalled and met the love of the penitent sinner; but in his human friendships, in the personal affection which, as man, He had for the beloved disciple and for the Three of Bethany, He surely looked (as the best of us in our measure look) for what was purest, sweetest, most unstained, in man or woman. In this case, therefore, I think that a more true *sentiment* has guided us to a right conclusion, even as a more accurate criticism has in the other case.[1]

It is a question of very inferior interest what

[1] It is very remarkable that a living writer, such as Bonar, in one of his most beautiful hymns ("Weary of earth, and laden with my sin"), should give the name of "Mary" to this woman. Whether he identifies her with Mary of Bethany, or Mary of Magdala, or both, I know not; but I should imagine it must be the former, since there is no possible ground in the text of Scripture for the latter.

"city" this nameless one belonged to. The scene of this part of St. Luke's narrative lies in Galilee; but, on the other hand, this particular section is so far disconnected, that it might quite well belong to one of those visits to Jerusalem of which St. John makes us aware. And no doubt women of her class would be found in Jerusalem far more frequently than in any other city of the Jews: a considerable Gentile element or a foreign garrison would be almost necessary antecedents to their existence. If the narrative of the woman taken in adultery was really written by St. Luke (as many think), and became attached to the Fourth Gospel because it belonged to the ministry at Jerusalem, it would then appear less improbable that we have here another (and, in subject-matter, not dissimilar) fragment from the same ministry, retaining its place in St. Luke's Gospel. Certainly it is in complete accord with the whole tone and scope of this Evangelist to have preserved two such exquisite pictures of the love of Christ for sinners.

Having got an alabaster vase of myrrh.—St. Luke does not say how she "got" it: perhaps she spent her money on it; perhaps it had been given her in other days, and she had been ashamed to use it on herself: now she feels that what had been only a reproach to her might be turned to holy and profitable account at last.

Verse 38. *Standing at his feet behind him.*—This implies, as the commentators point out, that the couch on which our Lord reclined at meat was of some height. It does *not* however in itself argue any humility in the woman, as if she would not ven-

ture to "meet his eye:" as our Lord's face was turned to the table, she *could* only approach Him from behind.

This, however, is but a paltry thing to speak of, for here we touch upon a matter most wonderful and beautiful—the blessed audacity, I mean, of the woman in entering Simon's house, and that at the hour of dinner, before the eyes of the assembled guests. It is hardly possible, I suppose, to measure the strength of the barriers which failed to keep her out. *We* know the enormous potency of social barriers which make a rich man's threshold as impassable to the uninvited poor as the flame-defended gate of Eden to exiled Adam. But there were in her case religious barriers quite as strong, comparatively unknown to us. Had she touched one of the other guests, instead of Jesus, no doubt he would have felt obliged to leave the meal untasted, to go home and change his clothes and bathe himself, and still remain unclean awhile, ere he was purged from the taint of that pollution. This she knew and felt, and under any other circumstances would have shrunk into any corner to escape their scornful eyes, and would have crept aside (for who so broken in spirit as they who *have been* bold?) like some beaten animal which seeks to hide itself from sight and notice. But on this day all fear or regard of human opinion left her, or, rather, was swallowed up in an overmastering desire. This one thing she knew, that Jesus was there; this one thing felt, that she must get at Him, must shew Him her devotion, must win from Him, if it were possible, a word of pardon and peace.

Weeping, began to wash his feet with her tears.—

Unrestrained and passionate indeed must have been her weeping! No lightly-passing shower of April skies, but the full downpouring of the lowering swollen clouds of autumn. And surely we have here a tacit reproof to those who look so coldly (as some do) upon anything *passionate* — exaggerated, they would say—in the expression of religious emotion. Had they been there, would they not have said (with some truth, too) that her display of affection was very "earthly;" that she had but turned upon another and higher Object the unrestrained feelings of her former life? Might they not have bid her enter into her closet and weep there, rather than make that show before the eyes of men? To these possible objections our Lord silently but emphatically replies by receiving and commending every circumstance of her passionate service to Himself. Let her weep her heart out; let her kiss her heart out upon his sacred feet; let her lavish upon Him the same endearments she might have profanely wasted upon a human lover, had she ever been able to love one well enough. The safeguard of love towards our dear Lord is *not* to be found in cold restraints, or in warnings to be "spiritual:" it *is* to be found in *Him.* He only, who is God most holy, can receive with perfect safety, without the possibility of harm, the utmost warmth of the most passionate affection. It is sometimes cast as a reproach upon the more devout Christianity of the day that it is "anthropomorphic" in faith and worship. It is not, I think, answered so distinctly and directly as it ought to be —that *our* faith and worship must be essentially

"anthropomorphic," because it centres about Him who "was found in fashion as a man." Be it that God in *Himself* is "unknowable" (as they say); *we* know the Father in the Son, and the Son we know as Christ Jesus; and no man was ever so thoroughly "knowable" as Jesus, because no man was ever so absolutely consistent with Himself. It is in strict dependence upon this principle that we maintain that in our religious worship all pure human emotions, however passionate, are rightly and laudably directed upon the God-man whom we know, and, knowing, love and adore.

Shall we ask what moved her to weep so bitterly? It was of course her faith; faith, vague and undefined, no doubt, yet faith in Him as one immeasurably better and higher than herself, who yet had stooped, at much cost to Himself, to care for her soul and to seek to save it; and this was saving faith. But, looking at it from a lower point of view, we are not so ignorant of human nature as to be perplexed by that vehement sorrow. If we know anything of the secret of the religious influence of one soul over another for good, we know that that secret lies in the union of personal purity, of tenderness, and of strength. It is such men that take us by the right hand and pluck us out of the slough,—that worst slough of despond in which we were sullenly content to abide because none offered to help us out. It is in the presence of such that the possibility of goodness which we had despaired of, the beauty of holiness which we had disbelieved, and the unspeakable hatefulness of sin which we had laughed at, rush over the soul in a flood which

(for the time) sweeps all before it. Now in Jesus were found, without measure, these three things—holiness, tenderness, strength.

And wiped them with the hairs of her head.—Some see in this the self-avenging conscience of past sins and follies; as if, mindful how idly she had decked her hair, how worse than idly used it as a snare, she would now for his sake put it to the lowest purpose. But then Mary the sister of Lazarus did the same, and we cannot believe that she had any such revenges to take upon herself. Rather it was the unstudied instinct of a love which pleased itself in using the very best, in devoting that which is the natural "glory" of a woman to the service of her Master and Lord.

Verse 39. *Spake with himself, saying.*—This much Simon said to himself, not aloud; the rest of his internal argument he did not even say to himself. I suppose it was to him so self-evident, so much a matter of course, that it did not even rise into consciousness. This is singularly true to the facts of mental reasoning: the mind does not represent even to itself all the stages by which it reaches its conclusions; it leaps over what is unquestioned and unquestionable to the conclusion which lies beyond. What Simon said to himself was perfectly true, "If this man were a prophet, he would have known who and what kind of person this woman is." What Simon did *not* say to himself, because he thought it unquestionable, was simply false, "If He knew who she is, He would not suffer her to touch Him." How often the most ruinous mistakes of mankind lie exactly in those unquestioned assumptions which

they do not put into words, but only argue and act from!

Verse 40. *Jesus answering.*—Answering, *i.e.* (as so often), the man's thoughts, not his words, and not even the thought of which he was conscious, but the thought which remained latent in his mind, though powerful to produce other thoughts.

Verse 41. *There were two debtors to one creditor.*—Simon, namely, and the woman; both therefore in the same case and strait, equally helpless, equally at the mercy of the creditor; and that creditor, Jesus. Only not astounding because so familiar, is the calm assumption—all the more monstrous from its very calmness, its absence of colour and rhetoric—of this speech. Our Lord speaks to his own host, whose bread he was eating, and quietly puts him on a level with a harlot as respects Himself. For if both had "nothing to pay," how was one in any better position than the other, practically? It is true that if the parable stood alone we should not know whether our Lord intended Himself or his Father in heaven by the creditor. But his subsequent words, and the fact that the "much love" of which He spake was unquestionably towards Himself, leave no possible doubt. When Simon thought over these things afterwards, how aghast he must have stood at the enormous presumption of his Guest, who represented Himself as the creditor in whose debt, at whose mercy, lay Simon and the woman, and (*pari ratione*) all the world beside! All this, however, is in exact accordance with those other enormous and truly "superhuman" assumptions which characterize the Sermon on the Mount and other discourses in St.

Matthew, assumptions which have always seemed to me more conclusive of the Divinity of Christ than any number of isolated texts, because morally irreconcilable with any other theory of his Being. Had He been anything less than in the fullest sense Divine, by what possible perversion could our sins have been represented as a debt owing to Him? by what conceivable arrogance could the forgiveness of those sins be made dependent upon love to Him, shewn forth by personal attention to Him?

Verse 44. *Seest thou this woman?*—He *had* seen her, to scorn and condemn her: our Lord wants him to see her, to admire and envy her. In the contrast that follows it is needful to bear in mind the respective places of these three things—the water for the feet, the kiss, the oil for the head—in the social code of that day. To offer water for the feet, in a country where sandals only were worn in the streets and nothing in the house, was an act of the most elementary courtesy, and its omission a piece of downright rudeness; to give the kiss of welcome was an act of conventional politeness, the withholding of which was a slight; to present fragrant oil for the head was a mark of friendliness which by itself our Lord would perhaps hardly have expected from Simon, and hardly perhaps have accepted. That Simon had omitted all three courtesies shewed conclusively that he was not disposed to treat our Lord as a friend, or as an equal. He had, no doubt, asked Him to dinner out of curiosity, having heard many strange things of Him, and desiring to hear Him for himself. But having done this much he felt that he had gone quite far enough, and would go no further; he could

not bring himself to be polite, not even to be commonly civil, to his invited guest.

No doubt, also, this feeling of his was as much social as it was religious. If we should say that Simon thought that he was a gentleman, and that *our Lord was not*, we run the risk of offending our own sense of propriety, but we are probably not far from the truth. There can be no doubt that much social hauteur and much consideration of wealth mingled with the religious exclusiveness of the Pharisees. Nor can there be any doubt that Simon treated our Lord, who "for our sakes became poor," with personal rudeness just because He was poor. And, what is much more surprising at first sight than the fact of Simon's rudeness, is the fact that our Lord felt the rudeness and made no pretence of not feeling it: He called attention to it most pointedly and plainly. Most of us, so treated, would have affected not to notice it; pride, if nothing else, would have kept our mouths shut. I need not say that there was no place for pride in *Him*. But I may point out that the absence of pride was not simply due to his humility, in which He bowed his head meekly to every insult: it was also due to that consciousness of his own immeasurable superiority which could not leave Him. Simon's rudeness caused Him pain; but the pain was for Simon himself, who had lost (and worse than lost) so glorious an opportunity of entertaining, not angels, but the Lord of angels, unawares: salvation had come to his house too, as to Zacchæus's,—but he had despised so great salvation. And yet, as good ever comes out of evil, so Simon's rudeness, sad as it was, only serves to set off

for ever by way of foil and contrast the lavish and lowly affection of the woman.

Verse 47. WHEREFORE *I say unto thee.*—Notice then that our Lord makes all to depend upon the personal treatment He had received from the Pharisee and the sinner. What *we* often do in our insolence and self-conceit, as though every man's real worth were measured by his respect for us, *that* He did, the meek and lowly One, in his infinite truthfulness and love. Had He been any other than He was, we should have said that in that "wherefore" He attached a natural but exaggerated importance to personal attentions to Himself. But we know that He was throughout consistent in this;[1] we know that He went so far as to lay down the very same rule as that which shall decide the fate of all nations at the last day: "I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat," &c.; "I was an hungred, and ye gave me no meat," &c. In a word, it is with us as with Simon and that woman; our treatment of Him now will decide his treatment of us hereafter. Nor let any one say that there is any real difference between the cases; that it was the relief of necessities which our Lord insisted upon in the one case; that it was the display of affection and reverence on which He dwelt in the other. No line can be drawn between them. Simon would never have dreamt of visiting our Lord if He had been "sick and in prison:" this woman would have sought Him *there* more gladly than in Simon's house. Hence there arises this notable lesson, that

[1] Compare, *e.g.*, as a slightly different expression of the same phase of his character, that saying in St. John xix. 11, "Therefore he that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin." In any other accused person, however exalted and innocent, it would be intolerable that he should occupy himself in weighing the comparative degrees of guilt in his enemies.

any failure in courtesy, any lack of genuine politeness, any withholding of kindly offices from those whom we think socially beneath us, is just as great an affront to Christ as though it had been shewn to Himself,—for "inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these my brethren, ye did it not to me." The spirit of hauteur and disdain is just the spirit of Simon; and it is the sad necessity of Simon now that he often has Jesus for his guest, and always for his neighbour.

For she loved much.—In these words, as compared with the foregoing parable (which itself is echoed in the clause following), lies the theological difficulty of the passage. One while our Lord intimates that she loved much because she *had been* much forgiven; another while He says that she was much forgiven because she loved much. There are of course many parallel instances of a kind of "inversion" of which our Lord was evidently very fond. Everybody will recall his answer to the question, "Who is my neighbour?" which takes such an unexpected and subtly instructive turn, and is (in form) no answer at all. Still, that a difficulty exists is clear, and the commentators, who are obliged to make it quite clear and logical, are full of doubts which statement to enforce and which to explain away. The Vulgate indeed has actually rendered ἀγαπησει by *diligit* in *Verse* 42, "which of them *doth love* him more?" as if to suggest that the greater debtor was forgiven most because he was already most in favour.[1] I need not

[1] Cornelius à Lapide actually argues at length for this reading of the parable, although he knew that the Greek has the future. I give some of his words, because they are so strange: "Is qui plurium a suo creditore accepit remissionem passim judicabitur, ideo majorem hanc remissionem a creditore ac-

say that this is a wanton perversion, both of the literal reading and of the manifest meaning of the passage: the only difference intimated between the debtors is in the amount of their debt before, of their gratitude afterwards.

Can then both be true? Is it our conception of forgiveness as a definite and formal act *in time* that is in fault? Shall we say that forgiveness exists and has existed in the mind of God eternally—aye, and forgiveness of individual sinners, too—though only in the "fulness of time" doth it pass forth and lodge within the soul which welcomes it? Is not the very inversion of which we are thinking—the apparent interchange of causal relation between human love and Divine forgiveness—meant, not so much to destroy, as to supplement, the formality of our ideas and dogmas as to the remission of sins? There was, it is clear, a sense in which forgiveness frank and free was not only possible, but extant, for the sins both of the woman and of Simon; and in some way from the knowledge of such forgiveness sprang the eager love of the penitent. There was also, we must not shrink from maintaining, a sense in which the eager love of the penitent (itself an effect of Divine grace) was found worthy to be crowned with the further grace of pardon for all the past. I do not think that a true theology will try to balance itself between these by verbal reconciliations, much less to set forth one at the expense of the other; but, glorifying both, to leave them as complemental, not coincident, aspects of one blessed truth.

cepisse, quod magis eum dilexerit, ac plura ei officia et signa benevolentiæ exhibuerit, *ob quæ plura vicissim illi remisit et condonavit creditor*: simili ergo modo," &c.

Verse 50. *Thy faith hath saved thee.*—To hold a correct dogmatic definition of "saving faith" has been — I suppose is still — considered the most important criterion of a standing or a falling Church. Yet I defy anybody to put into dogmatic shape this woman's "saving faith." It put itself into shape, but it was the shape of feeling and of action; of love which braved all to express itself in outward acts of reverence and affection; of sorrow which found more joy in bitter weeping than ever in laughter and in song; of personal devotion which recked nothing of any one else's opinion, if only it might gain one kind word from Him. Whoever they be whose faith makes them thus to feel and thus to act towards the Blessed One, they need not fear but that theirs is "saving faith."

RAYNER WINTERBOTHAM.

THE RICH YOUNG RULER.

ST. MATTHEW XIX. 21.

To the Editor of the Expositor.

SOME time since I chanced to attend a Service of which, as I picked up at it a new expository idea—to me at least it was quite new—it has struck me that both you and your readers might like to have a brief report. While sauntering through one of our large provincial towns, with an evening on my hands, I came on a gate opening into a garden in which there stood a large room lit up (apparently) for worship. Seeing two poor but respectable looking old men turn in at the gate, I asked them whether service was going on, and whether it was open to the public. "Yes," they said, and would I go in; I should be quite welcome. Accordingly I followed them into a well-furnished room, in which some thirty or forty persons were assembled, most of whom were evidently of a higher social class than the two old men who conducted me. There was a look of intelligence about this small congregation, and an air of quiet devotion, which gave promise of a pleasant hour. My conductors were obviously quite at home—more

than one kind face smiled recognition and welcome at them as they passed up the room. They seated themselves in the centre, right in front of the Preacher's desk, having first found me a comfortable seat behind them, and supplied me with a Bible and the hymn-book in use. In a few moments the Preacher came in—a man of about forty, with nothing remarkable in his appearance except that he was somewhat carelessly and unclerically attired. But when he rose to speak it was not difficult to infer, from the tones of his voice, the play of his features, and his whole bearing, that he had not read either books or men wholly in vain. The omen I had drawn from the aspect of the congregation was fulfilled. We *had* a pleasant, and in some ways an impressive, hour. The Preacher read for lesson the eighteenth Chapter of the Gospel of St. Luke, and followed the lesson with a simple and earnest prayer, so spiritual and so catholic in its tone, that I doubt whether even "our incomparable Liturgy" would have moved me more. Then we sang a hymn, as we had also done at the opening of the service, accompanied, to my great delight, by the crisp tones of a good Broadwood piano, instead of by the usual drone of a harmonium. And then the Preacher rose and delivered a sermon, the substance of which I will try to convey. He took for his text St. Mathew xix. 21, and spoke extemporaneously for about half an hour, maintaining a conversational tone for the most part, but now and then rising into more impassioned moods of speech. And this, as nearly as I can recall it, was what he said.

I took this text at our last week-evening Service, meaning quite honestly to make it my theme; but, like many before me, I was drawn away from my theme by the singular attractions of the Young Ruler whom Jesus loved. Ever since this story was written men have been charmed, fascinated, by it: they have been drawn to this amiable Young Man by the beauty of his character, by its yet brighter promise. They have felt, as probably *we* have felt, that had he been true to himself, had he followed the better impulses of his nature, had he left "all" to follow Christ, he might have shone the bright particular star of the apostolic company, blending the ardour of a St. Paul with the deep and tranquil tenderness of a St. John.

But not only are men drawn to him by the loveliness and the promise of his character; they are also attracted by the uncertainty which hangs over his fate. From the beginning the question has been asked, "Was this man whom Jesus loved saved by his love? or was he lost, after all, and in that love's despite?" And from the beginning this question has been differently answered, according to the different temperaments of those who have taken it upon themselves to reply to it. Those who are of a hard and austere temper have said, "He was lost," dwelling unduly on the fact that "he *went away*." Others, of a gentler nature, dwelling unduly perhaps on the fact that "he went away *sorrowful*," have said, "He was surely saved." But these answers have little value. Different, opposed as they are, they are vitiated by a common fault: they spring from natural impulse, from personal bias; they are not based on arguments fairly drawn from the facts of the sacred narrative.

Now I tried to supply this lack of evidence last week, by reminding you of the Conversation which fell out between our Lord and his disciples as the Young Ruler left the Presence he had so eagerly sought. In that Conversation we found three sayings, each of which at least lends itself to the gentler alternative of this Young Man's fate. Our Lord said, first: "How hard is it for the rich, for those who trust in riches, how almost impossible for them, to enter into the kingdom of God!" and then, "If impossible with men, it is not impossible with God, since all things are possible to Him:" and then, "Many first shall be last; and many last, first."

First, lest his disciples should judge the Young Man harshly, He began to make excuse for him who had made no excuse for himself—reminding them how much he had to leave, how hard it was for a young man, softly and tenderly reared, to abandon leisure, books, and the ample comforts of an opulent home, for a life of utter penury, self-mortification, and dependence.

Then, for his own consolation—for if the Young Ruler was sorry to go away, we may be very sure that the Lord Jesus was still more sorry to see him go—He falls back on the thought that, if this noble choice, this losing exchange, this gainful loss, be hard to impossibility with men, it is very possible that God may lead or drive them to it. *He* may take away what the Young Ruler cannot give up, and so compel him, by deep need and misery, into the kingdom he could not enter of his own choice.

And then, when He found that even the apostles were *trusting* in riches though they had them not, believing it to be easier for rich than for poor men to be saved, boasting of what they themselves had "left," asking what they were to have therefor, and looking for visible and temporal rewards; when they carried themselves as though they had lost much and gained little by following Him, the Lord Jesus warned them: "You indeed stand first in my kingdom now; but, if you cherish this vulgar and covetous temper, you may only too easily put yourselves last; and this Young Ruler, for whom you care so little and I so much, though he now stand last, yet, if he cherish the pure aspiring temper which brought him to me, may and will come to stand among the first."

These were the arguments I adduced in behalf of a favourable verdict on this Young Man. They are all drawn from the narrative itself. They still seem to me sufficiently strong to carry with ease the conclusion we imposed upon them. But there is an argument in favour of that verdict which I did not give you last week, and that for the best reason in the world—I had not got it to give. Only this evening, as I walked here, intending to speak to you on another theme, I have made one of those slight discoveries which at times, even more than matters of weightier import, feelingly persuade every sensible man what a fool he is; how apt to overlook obvious facts, even when they stare him full in the face and he is anxiously looking for them; how prone to travel in ancient time-worn ruts of thought, and to tread in the steps of those who have gone before him, without once asking whether there is no more simple and direct path to the goal.

Now as the Preacher thus took himself to task a smile of sympathy and amusement ran through the Congregation, and I could see that most of them settled into an attitude of still more earnest attention. I fancy they knew their man, and felt that something specially good was coming. Unmoved apparently by this little stir of interest, the Preacher went on :—

If any of you care to share that wholesome conviction with me—and it will be creditable to you if you do, since it is one to which only *sensible* persons are open; if you care to feel anew how foolish and blind we are even when we are most sincerely trying to see, you may easily do it. You have only to answer one or two quite simple questions. I do not doubt you have often read this story, read it in each of the three Evangelists who record it, and

read it with the question in your minds, "Was this Young Man saved or was he lost?" Well, to what conclusion have you come, and on what grounds? How does your mind stand affected toward him now? Do you think *that* a natural and reasonable question to ask about him? Do you think it ever should have been raised? Or have you discovered any fact, *in the narrative itself*, which conclusively settles that question, and makes you ashamed of ever having mooted it? If you have not, you need no further proof that you have never seen this Young Man truly and accurately; that you, too, have been foolish and blind even when you were most sincerely trying to see. For there *is* a fact in the inspired narrative itself, and a fact which it requires no learning and no critical acumen to discover, which, as I believe you will acknowledge, settles that question conclusively, and ought to have saved us from ever puzzling our brains over it.

Here the Preacher paused, and all the people began to turn over the leaves of their Bibles, which they evidently knew how to handle, and to search for this recondite yet obvious fact.

If you would see what it is, fix your attention on this point. The Young Ruler asked *two* questions of Christ, not one only; and my text is an answer to the *second* question, not the first. Blending the reports of the three Evangelists, the story runs thus. A young man—amiable, learned, pure—came to Jesus, asking, "What shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?" Jesus replied: "You know the commandments; *keep* them: *they* are the way to life." The Young Man, modest yet sincere, is able to say that he *has* kept them. And it is at this point of the

story we are told that "Jesus, looking on him, loved him." Loved him for what? For his purity, for his obedience, for his discontent with a mere observance of carnal commandments, for the moral sweetness and wholesomeness of his nature. Christ's love for him was a virtual acknowledgment of, as it was an instinctive response to, the fact, that the Ruler was, and long had been, in that state of free spiritual obedience to the will of God, and therefore in that faith in the Divine Righteousness and Love which, then as now, was the highway of salvation.

But, now, the Young Man has a second question to ask. He is not content with merely saving his soul alive; he wants to be "perfect and entire, lacking nothing:" he wants to stand before God without spot, or blemish, or any such thing. And he asks, "What lack I yet?" And to *this* question our Lord replies: "*If thou wilt be perfect,* sell all thou hast; leave all you love; take up the cross, and come, follow me." The question, you perceive, *is not one of salvation at all, but one of perfection.* The Young Man does not ask, "How may I escape hell?" or even, "How may I get into heaven?" but, "How may I become heavenly while I am here upon the earth?" The question of salvation has been settled already; the question now is simply, *How shall a young man, who has been saved, become perfect in righteousness?* And, therefore, we need entertain no doubt of this Young Man's fate. If we raise the question, Was he saved? was he lost? we simply prove that we are of those who have eyes but see not, ears but do not understand.

Here there was a general sigh of relief, and an audible murmur of satisfaction filled the room. I confess I joined in it; for, led on by

the earnestness of the speaker, I had got to be deeply interested in that Young Man's fate: and in the sentences I have italicized the Preacher had given me a new and suggestive idea.

To be saved is one thing, my friends; to become perfect is another, and a very different thing. If none but the perfect were to be saved, what chance would there be for *us?*

"Isn't *that* good?" said one of the two old men who sat before me, quite audibly. "*Ah,*" replied the other, twisting his wrinkled and weatherbeaten face into a queer smile of satisfaction, and throwing a whole world of meaning into that single exclamation.

And, for aught that I can see, we need have no more doubt of this pure and gentle Young Man's salvation than of our own: and certainly we need have no doubt of *that,* if at least we care to be saved; for if we care to be saved, how much more must the good God care to save us?

And here, as the Preacher asked that simple pathetic question with much animation and earnestness, the very simplicity of it seemed to carry it deep into the hearts of the old men before me. They looked at each other with tears in their eyes, their hard stiff features working with pleasurable and affectionate emotion, too moved even to speak to each other, though each seemed to enjoy the thought the more because he felt that the other was enjoying it too.

Much more might be said about this fair and noble-spirited young man, and many more arguments adduced, if they were not unnecessary and impertinent, for the good hope we entertain for him. But I really must not take this text a second time, and say nothing on the theme it places before us. For that theme is a very momentous one, both in speculation and in practice. *What is the way of perfection?* Is it to sell all we have, to leave all we love, to adopt a celibate and ascetic life, to abandon the duties, affections, charities of the home, to devote ourselves to a

course of hardship, penury, self-mortification, self-renunciation, and self-sacrifice? When our Lord says, "*If thou wilt be perfect*, give all you have to the poor, take up the cross, and follow me," is He laying down the *sole* rule of perfection? Does He give the ideal, or the only true ideal, or even the purest and loftiest ideal, of human life? Many of the greatest saints the world has seen, many of the most fervent and successful preachers of righteousness, have both answered that question in the affirmative and acted on their answer to it. Many good men and women cleave to that ideal, and live by it, to this day. And much as we may deplore the errors, speculative and practical, commonly associated with that ideal, are we quite sure that the ideal itself is an erroneous one? In the more tender and devout moods of the soul, have *we* never thought, never said within ourselves, "If I were wise enough and strong enough to leave, to relinquish, all I most love, to give up all thought of worldly gain and domestic happiness, to devote my whole time, energies, affections, to the service of God and man, my life would be far more pure, and lofty, and perfect than it is. I should be a better man, nearer God, nearer heaven."

If *we* have not known, or have not cherished, this impulse, there are myriads of meditative and tender souls around us to whom it constantly recurs, and who reproach themselves keenly if they do not yield to it. So that the question, you see, is of grave practical importance. We are bound to consider it, bound to ask, "Is *this* the true ideal of life, or is it only an adaptation of that ideal to the special needs and capacities of this man or that?" And before we

assume it to be the sole, or even a complete, ideal, we should remember that our Lord did not demand of every man, nor indeed of most, what He demanded of the Young Ruler; nor did He Himself act on the rule which many of his followers have found in these words. Lazarus of Bethany was a well-to-do, if not a wealthy, man. Yet Jesus did not bid him abandon his pleasant home, his loving sisters, his ancestral fields, to embrace a life of constant hardship and poverty. And though our Lord Himself was poor, so poor that at times He had not where to lay his head, He was not ascetic. He was to be found at tables where there was pleasant company and sumptuous fare. He would even eat and drink with sinners—and many sinners are more pleasant people, at least to dine with, than some saints. Nay, He would even eat and drink with Pharisees, although even as He ate their bread and drank their wine they were plotting against Him, or looked with contempt and suspicion on his grace to sinners, doubting whether He were not a sinner Himself. Men never mistook Him for a monk or a hermit, but they did call Him "Glutton" and "Winebibber." There is a clear and obvious contrast between the ideal embodied in John the Baptist and that incarnated in *the man* Christ Jesus. And the Man is our example, not the Hermit.

We must not take my text, then, as setting forth the sole, or even a complete, ideal of human life. The true ideal is to be found only in Jesus Christ the Righteous. We must rather take it as setting forth a modification, a limitation of that ideal suited to the conditions, capacities, aspirations of the Young Ruler.

Whether or not it be suited to us must be determined by us, and by the Spirit of God in us. But, for the most part, we are not called to *seek* hardships, to impose sacrifices on ourselves, to choose for ourselves a difficult and perilous path and to insist on taking it. Any man who really endeavours to lead a righteous life will *find* quite as many hardships in his path as he can well endure, and quite as many sacrifices will be demanded of him as he is able to make. We need not wilfully add to our burdens. We need not shrink from any relief, from any innocent mirth, from any pure affection, from any lawful gain, from any domestic charity or pleasure. But while we take all these, and rejoice in them all, let us bear well in mind that, if Christ does not call us to abandon the world, He does call on us so to detach ourselves from the spirit of the world as that we hold all gain and pleasure subordinate to our convictions of duty, to the obedience and ministry of truth and righteousness. We need not go in quest of hardships and sacrifices; but, if we pursue truth and righteousness and charity as our supreme ends, sacrifice and hardship will not be long in finding us out. The Christian life offers no easy career. Heaven is very high; how can we reach it but by hard climbing? We *must* take up the cross, if we would wear the crown. If we would be *perfect*, we must part with much that we have, leave much that we love, forego much that would be pleasant, not to flesh and blood alone, but also to mind and heart. You need not actually sell all that you have perhaps, but you cannot buy the truth for nothing. You need not "go into the wilderness," but at times you will know what it is to feel

solitary and alone, and even to sigh for a lodge in some vast wilderness. "Locusts and wild honey" need not be your only fare; but, if you try to be perfect, you will at least know the taste of the bread of affliction, and your tears will sometimes be your only drink. Even so be it, Lord Jesus, if so we may be made partakers of thy righteousness and love!

This is but a poor and brief report of the somewhat remarkable discourse which it was my good hap to hear, though I wrote down all that I could recall of it immediately the Service was over. There was much in it which I could not attempt to report without running too great a risk of spoiling it. And notably two little pictures which the Preacher drew of the Young Ruler before, and after, his interview with Christ. In the first, he pourtrayed the Young Man as giving a dinner to some of his old fellow-students in his refined and luxurious home, surrounded by the books, manuscripts, works of art, musical instruments of divers sorts, &c., with which he occupied and beguiled his hours. He set the young men talking; and when his companions complimented him on his manifold and great possessions, he described the Ruler as protesting that all these were as nothing to him, that he would willingly give them all up, if only he could thus secure the wisdom and excellence, the perfection, to which he aspired. And, in the second, the Young Man was still more forcibly described as returning, after he had been put to the test and had failed, to the same luxurious apartment, abashed, cut to the very heart, by the discovery of how much all these possessions, of which he had spoken so lightly, were to him, how dependent he was on them, how much of his "goodness" sprang from temperament, from affluent circumstances and happy conditions, and the absence of temptation; as discovering, moreover, how all the sweetness had gone out of his life and its conditions, now that he knew himself as he was, till his "possessions" grew to be intolerable to him, and he was driven by shame and regret and self-contempt to the very life of service and self-abnegation which had seemed impossible to him when Christ had invited him to it. As he depicted these two scenes, the Preacher seemed to have them before his eyes, and to be describing only what he saw. I regret that I can give nothing but these broken and imperfect hints of what I felt at the time to be the most impressive and beautiful part of the discourse.

CARPUS.

SCIENCE AND THEOLOGY;

OR,

THE REASONABLENESS OF THE CARDINAL VERITIES OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH.

THE birth, the death, and the resurrection of our Lord are historical events, for each of which appropriate evidence is at our command, and evidence more abundant and more cogent, as we believe, than can be adduced for any other historical facts of an equally remote date. Nay, more; even for the facts that the birth of Christ was an incarnation, and that his resurrection was followed and consummated by an ascension into heaven, we possess a mass of evidence so appropriate in kind and of such immense force, as should, in our judgment, suffice to carry conviction to every reasonable mind that will fairly consider it.

How comes it to pass, then, that many reasonable and virtuous men, many even who hold fast to the morality taught by Christ, and who still take part in the worship of the Church, are beginning to doubt these cardinal verities of the Christian Faith? It is, as I believe and will try to shew, because, while they do not mean to be unreasonable or unjust, they do not treat the evidence fairly; because, though they claim to be eminently reasonable men, they treat it unreasonably: and that in two ways.

1. First, there are many who, in place of looking at the Christian Faith as a whole, or even in its larger aspects, detach this fact or that in the life of our Lord from the rest, demand for this isolated fact a kind of proof of which it is not susceptible; and then, because they cannot get the kind of evidence they demand, permit themselves to speak of this fact, if not of the whole Christian system, as incredible or disproved. For example, I have known men, and men not altogether destitute of intelligence and good sense, fix on the Gospel story of the conception and birth of Christ, detach it from all that goes before and all that comes after it, treat it as an isolated event, declare that, thus viewed, no kind or amount of evidence would make it credible to them, and even break rude jests over it as an absurd fable which no sane man could be expected to accredit. For all purposes of accurate thought and fair conclusion they might as well detach one of the recently discovered moons of Mars from the solar system, study its motions and aspects as if it stood alone in the sky, and then triumphantly proclaim that the received astronomical theory was an imposture or a delusion. Why, there is hardly a fact in their own lives which, if it were thus detached from all connection with their character and history, could be either vindicated or explained. In every life the main events hang together, they are parts of a complex whole; and only when we view them as parts, and in due relation to the whole, can we hope to comprehend them. In like manner the supernatural birth, the incarnation, of our Lord, if at least it is to be treated rationally, must be viewed in its relation to his whole character and career, in its

connection with all that went before and all that came after it. If we take it by itself, and say, "Here was a child, the son of a virgin, with no father but God!" it is as easy to doubt and even to deride it as it is impossible to prove and explain it. But if, as we are bound to do, we take the whole Scripture hypothesis concerning the work and person of Christ, that which before was incredible becomes reasonable, credible, true. For we cannot deny that men have always been groping after God, if haply they might find Him; or that, left to themselves, they have never been able to find Him out to perfection, never even to frame such a conception of Him as would satisfy them. Not the book of Job alone, but all the great religious poems and confessions of Antiquity prove that the supreme religious craving of the race has been to see a *humanized* God, to behold the Divine Glory in the face and heart of a man. And who can deny that, if this craving were to be met, men needed to be prepared for its fulfilment; or that, according to the Scriptures, one race of men was set apart for centuries, and trained and educated by God Himself, in order that in and through them this craving might be satisfied? If there be a God, is it not reasonable to believe that He is good, loving, kind? If He be good and loving and kind, is it not reasonable to believe that He would shew Himself to the men who so much needed and longed to know Him? If He should shew Himself at all, is it not reasonable to believe that He would shew Himself within the limits and compass of humanity, since in no other way could He so adequately and persuasively reveal Himself to them? In man we find good and evil strangely

blended. If, then, to meet the need and craving of the race, God were to become man, is it not reasonable to believe that He would assume that which is pure and noble and akin to Himself in our nature, "not abhorring the *virgin's* womb," and yet not take on Himself that which was evil and impure and base? But if all this be reasonable, then the Christ of the Gospels is reasonable, and neither his human motherhood nor his Divine fatherhood should seem incredible to us. We may rationally believe that the God who is always with men, and in them, once took human form, in order to prove to our longing hearts that He is not far from every one of us, in order to let us see what He is really like, and, by manifesting his love for us, to win our love in return.

This, of course, is very far from being the whole teaching of Scripture on the incarnation of Christ. But with no more than these hints and outlines before us, I do not fear to ask which is the more reasonable of the two? the man who, detaching the birth of Christ from the vast system of thought and action of which it is but a single incident, rejects it as an incredible myth or fable: or the man who, connecting it with the whole scheme of Providence, and the whole course of human history, and all the deepest cravings of the spiritual heart, confesses that, in this its proper setting, he sees nothing incredible in it, but much to render it credible, much even to persuade him that it is true?

But if the Incarnation be credible—if it is reasonable to believe that God, or the everlasting Word and Son of God, became a man and dwelt among us —then that great miracle carries all other miracles in

its train. The God-Man cannot act as though He were only a man. By the necessity of his Divine nature He must also exert the creative and redeeming energies of God. The Almighty, sitting outside of and above this globe and sphere of Time, *may* touch it only through general laws; but if He descend and dwell within it, then He must do visibly and in a moment what before He had done invisibly and through long months or years of gradual change. If God, as all Deists admit, be the Centre and Source from which all the forces of the universe, physical and vital as well as moral and spiritual, ray out, how shall He stand by our side upon the earth and yet never once shew Himself to be the Lord of life and of death, the Source of all the hidden virtues of the universe, the Giver and Administrator of its laws? If Christ was God, if even He was—as the more thoughtful and spiritual Unitarians admit Him to be—the everlasting "Word" and "Wisdom" of God, then miracles were as natural to Him as they would be supernatural to us; and no reasonable man can well wonder at the signs and wonders He wrought. God turns water into wine every summer; God heals our diseases day by day; God quickens whom He will. And if Christ was, in any sense, God, if in Him God came down within the coasts and bounds of time, it was simply natural and becoming that whatsoever He had seen the Father do, *that* He should do also. On this hypothesis, all his miracles—from that wrought at the marriage feast in Cana of Galilee to that commenced in the garden grave of Joseph of Arimathea and consummated on the hill above Bethany—become as credible to our reason as they are dear to our faith.

Whenever, then, men are so unreasonable as to detach any one incident of our Lord's life from the whole scheme of his Person and Work as revealed in Scripture and formulated in the universal creed of the Church, let us at least be so reasonable as to insist on connecting it with that scheme: let us refuse to view and debate it apart from all that really proves and justifies and explains it. His incarnation—with the long preparation for it, both in the history of the chosen race and in the universal heart of man—his ministry with its attendant miracles, his atoning death, his resurrection from the dead, and his ascension into heaven, all hang together and illustrate each other. Any one of them may be improbable or difficult of proof if taken alone, apart from the rest; but, viewed as a whole, they sustain and prove each other: they are, they shew themselves to be, the true core and key of the long human story; they frame a coherent and consistent hypothesis which, as it was above the wit of man to invent, we can only believe to be the gift and revelation of God.

2. There is another way in which men so handle the gospel of Christ as to make its cardinal facts and verities — the Incarnation and the Resurrection, for example—appear incredible. They cut the very ground from under our feet by affirming the supernatural—all that transcends nature and human nature as we ordinarily see them—to be absolutely impossible. Accustomed to find law everywhere, even in the phenomena which look most anomalous, they pronounce all miracles to be violations of law, and, therefore, contrary to reason. Before we yield

to this conclusion, before we permit it to trouble and darken our faith, it will be well for us to consider these two points.

First, let men affirm what they will, the impossibility of the supernatural has *not* been demonstrated, nor is it at all likely to be. On the contrary, all the indications of the most recent scientific discoveries and speculations point in the opposite direction. Science has perchance discovered the final forms of matter in the atoms, or molecules, of which we have heard so much of late. And, moreover, Science shrewdly suspects, and has gone far to prove, that all the forces — chemical, mechanical, cosmical — which govern the motions and combinations of these atoms may be resolved into one. But on *the origin* of these atoms it is dumb. It cannot tell us whence they came, nor can it account for the forces by which they are shaped and ruled. Its foremost ministers admit, not only that they know nothing of the origin of matter, but that they cannot so much as demonstrate its reality. They confess that they know nothing of the great natural forces except the modes in which they act. And they acknowledge that the origin of *life* is even a more inscrutable mystery to them than that of matter and of force.

Science itself bearing witness, then, ample space and scope are left for the creative power of God. Nay, more: as of all the agents which affect the material world, the mind or will of man is confessedly the highest, it seems probable that Science itself will ere long return to the conception of an Intelligent Mind, an Almighty Will, as the true first cause of that vast complex of phenomena which we

name the universe. Assuredly its latest accepted hypothesis, the theory of evolution or development, tends steadily in that direction. This theory, which seeks to account for the τὸ πᾶν, "the universal all," by assuming that the whole organic universe—from the very lowest forms of life to the very highest—has been gradually evolved from certain germs or cells capable of assuming an immense variety of forms, is marked by a large and noble simplicity, which makes it at least as attractive as it is true. To conceive of God as patiently educing through interminable ages the vast and varied scene of universal life from a few primordial germs, perhaps even from one, wrought upon by a single force capable of taking many forms, is surely to think back all things to their origin as simply and as nobly as we can hope to do.

For the present, indeed, this hypothesis is only an hypothesis, and a very dubious hypothesis, let fanatics and enthusiasts, such as Professor Huxley, say what they will. But, for the sake of the argument, let us for a moment assume it to be true, and ask: On what principle can Science demand that the development which has risen from the mere atom or germ, through the graduated and rising scale of existence, to the lofty and reasonable nature of man, should be suddenly arrested at that point, so that to conceive of beings higher than man is to conceive the incredible? So far from being incredible, it is most probable that the development which has run so high should run higher still, and that there should be creatures as much above us in the scale of being, and as much more highly and subtly organized, as we are above the dog and the ape, or the oyster and

the polypus even, or even the weed that grows in our garden or the fungus which springs up in the moist warmth of the wood. And if there be these higher grades of life—as surely there must be, or what becomes of the hypothesis of development? —we may know as little of *them* as the inanimate, or the lower orders of animate, organisms know of us. As, moreover, the gift which distinguishes us even from the orders nearest to ourselves is the reasonable spirit which enables us to think and plan and forecast, so it is rational to believe that the grades and orders above us are distinguished from us by still larger gifts of intelligence and love, by a nature more spiritual than our own; and even, if they have external frames and organs, by organs and frames more delicate and more pliant to the spirits which inhabit them.

This, I think, we may fairly call *a scientific induction*, or, at least, *a scientific speculation*, if we care to put asunder two—Induction and Speculation—whom the British Association has done so much to join together. And how remarkably this induction, or speculation, accords with the Biblical revelation of an angelic hierarchy, grade rising above grade, and of the spirits of just men made perfect clothed in psychical bodies, I may leave every man to determine for himself. All I desire to do is to point out that angels, and perfect spirits in psychical bodies, are, to us at least, *supernatural* existences or modes of existence; and that, none the less, the fashionable scientific hypothesis of the hour, so far from disproving them, renders them a very credible and likely step in the long process of development.

Again : if Science, so far from having proved the supernatural to be impossible, rather favours the conclusion that what seems supernatural to us may nevertheless be included in the course and order of Nature, so also it is to be borne in mind that any scientific hypothesis is sound and valuable in proportion as it explains the facts for which it was invented to account. The very "law of gravitation" is still only a scientific assumption. It has not been, and cannot be, demonstrated with the rigid logic and precision with which we can prove the angles of every triangle to be equal to two right angles. It proves itself; that is, it explains all the facts to which it can fairly be applied. If it failed to explain many of them, if it even failed to explain any one of them, providing the fact were indisputable, the law would be questioned and denied.

Well, apply this axiom of Science to the life and work of our Lord. When we who believe set ourselves to study his life and ministry, we are arrested by certain sceptics with the objection, "But you are starting with the hypothesis that the supernatural is possible. You must discard that hypothesis. You must come to the investigation with a mind free from any prepossession." We reply, "But *you* are starting with the opposite hypothesis—that the supernatural is *im*possible, that miracles are incredible. You, in your turn, must discard that hypothesis, and bring a mind free even from negative prepossessions to this great inquest." If they decline to do that, they condemn themselves, for our theory, our assumption, is at least as probable as theirs; nay, as we have seen, it is far more probable. But if they rejoin, "But

we must have some working hypothesis to go upon; or, at least, when we have collected our facts, we must frame some hypothesis that shall connect and explain them," we instantly assent, and pledge ourselves to accept the hypothesis which best explains the facts.

What are the facts, then? The facts, as recorded in the Gospels and the subsequent history of the Church, are briefly these:—That, after many centuries of elaborate and gradual preparation, God revealed Himself to men in the person of a Man who claimed to be the Son of God, who affirmed and shewed that He came to do and to disclose the Divine Will. This Man taught as never man taught before or since, giving the world religious ideas and a moral law so high and pure as it had not entered the heart of sage or philosopher to conceive. To shew at once who He was, and how good God is, He wrought many miracles of healing and consolation, which were, at the same time, lessons full of a heavenly wisdom. But though He was—nay, *because* He was—the best of men and teachers, the world hated Him, rejected Him; and at last, as He always said they would, they put Him to a cruel and ignominious death. His disciples, a few poor men, uneducated save by Himself, lost all hope when He died, although He had promised that He would soon be with them again. When, in accordance with his promise, He rose from the dead, they could not believe for joy and wonder. After He rose, He tarried with them forty days, speaking to them of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God, and telling them that He would pour down his Spirit upon them, and

send them forth to conquer the very world which had rejected Him. In due time they received and went forth in his Spirit. Before three centuries had elapsed the whole civilized world *was* conquered by them, and the Cross overshadowed the throne of the Cæsars. Since then, although the faith Christ taught has been terribly corrupted by the Church, and the law He gave has been openly broken by those who have professed to be his servants, it has raised and purified all the conditions of human life; the world has received another heart and worn another face. And in every age, however feeble and corrupt, there have been myriads in whom the peculiar spiritual life of Christ has been reproduced, so that they too have overcome the world, and have lived unto God in that they have lived for men.

This is but a poor and imperfect abstract of the facts of Christ's life and work. To do it justice would require volumes penned under the enfranchising constraints of blended genius and inspiration, rather than a few bald sentences such as these. But even with only this bare abstract before him, I would fearlessly appeal to any reasonable man, and ask: On which hypothesis is the life of Christ and all that has come of it more explicable—on the natural hypothesis or on the supernatural? If we say that even the best of men was but a man at the best, how can we account for his claim to be more than man? how account for his miracles, for his resurrection from the dead, for his ascension into heaven? Nay, even if we could detach the miraculous element of his life from the merely natural and human, even then how should we account for the unapproached elevation of

his thoughts, for the purity and tenderness of his morality, for the amazing and quickening power of his word? How came it to pass that He, a poor untrained Jew, made the greatest spiritual discoveries of all time, breathed the loftiest, most catholic, most pure and heavenly spirit that ever animated the breast of man, and threw his spirit and discoveries into forms so penetrating, so potent, so universal, that they have charmed and conquered the world, and have constrained many myriads in every subsequent age to live a life truly unselfish and spiritual and divine?

I confess I do not see how these questions are to be answered by those who hold the merely natural hypothesis, who maintain that Christ was simply a man of the most unique capacity and the most eminent gifts. To me, at least, their hypothesis fails to account even for the poor residuum of facts concerning Him which they admit to be true; while it does not so much as touch those larger facts of the Incarnation, the Resurrection, the Ascension, for which we have as much evidence as for his perfect character and pure morality. On the other hand, the supernatural hypothesis, the assumption that He was "God with us," accounts for *all* that is recorded of Him and affirmed concerning Him—for his incarnation, for his miracles, for his resurrection, for his ascension into heaven, for his amazing yet undeniable power over the spirits of men, and of the best and wisest of men, no less than for his blameless character, his lofty doctrine, his pure commandments and rules of life. If that hypothesis is best which best explains all the facts it ought to explain, then

assuredly we do well to cast ourselves at the feet of this supreme and sovereign Man, and to cry, with sceptic Thomas, "My Lord, and my God!"

Without fear or hesitation, then, we affirm that even the facts concerning Him admitted by the most sceptical critics and historians demand for Him a supernatural origin and power. We affirm Him, that is, to have been as truly out of and above the ordinary course of Nature as, confessedly, He was within and under it, since on no other hypothesis can we frame any adequate explanation whether of his Person or of his Work. Certain votaries of Science may, indeed, cut the knot of this difficulty by pronouncing the supernatural to be impossible, the miraculous incredible. But it may be questioned whether even the most successful study of the facts and forces of the material universe entitles any man to speak with authority on the facts and forces of human life. It may be questioned whether even the most successful study of human nature and the long story of its development gives any man the right to speak with authority on that which transcends the merely human limit. And when on the strength of her study of nature and of human nature, Science, in the person of some of her votaries, ventures to pronounce all that lies beyond and above these limits to be unworthy of belief, she simply stultifies herself by overpassing her proper bounds; she commits herself to the most hazardous of logical forms—an universal negative: she even contradicts herself, since, in her last analysis, Science is for ever coming on forces—mechanical, chemical, vital—of the nature and origin of which she confesses her ignorance to be absolute:

and, worst of all, at least in her own eyes, she illogically arrests her pet theory of development at the moment it reaches the spirit that is in man, and contends, against all probability, that at *this* point the ascending grades of life are abruptly broken off.

Would that I could close here, leaving the whole burden of the scepticism and unbelief of our age on those "oppositions of Science" to Faith of which she is guilty when she is no longer true to her name. But, alas, it is not Science alone that has been to blame in this great controversy on the Person and Work of Christ. Theology has been equally at fault. Systems of dogmatic thought have long been current in the Church, so harsh, so crude, so irrational and self-contradictory, as to be utterly incredible to reasonable and reflective men. In their recoil from these they have, not unnaturally if unwisely, jumped at any sceptical hypothesis which has less obviously offended against reason and conscience. By insisting on these unreasonable dogmas, even more, I think, than by the narrow and ignoble morality which has too often characterized her, the Church has repelled the very men for whom she should have possessed the greatest charm, and has predisposed them to accept the sceptical theories in vogue in their several generations. I do not propose to discuss the various theological systems which have had their day, and which even yet have not quite ceased to be, by which the reason of thoughtful men has been affronted and repelled. That would carry us too far, and occupy us too long. All I intend to attempt is, to draw the contrast between what we of *this* generation may call the *old*

and the *new* theology; and briefly to indicate how, by its unreasonableness, this old theology drove men to scepticism and unbelief, and how, in the new, we may find a conception of the Person and Work of Christ in entire accord with the demands of reason and conscience.

The keyword to what I have called the old theology is *time;* the keyword to that which I mean by the new theology is *eternity.*

According to the old theology—the theology in which most of us, I suppose, were brought up—the work of Christ, the work of God in and through Christ, was an abrupt and arbitrary prodigy, a miraculous interruption of and departure from the ordinary methods of Divine action. There was nothing like it before, and there never would be anything like it again. It was forensic rather than moral in its tone and spirit; a gift of sovereign grace rather than a satisfaction of human wants and a condescension to human needs. All men were alike sinners, and all had an ineradicable and irresistible tendency to sin, not simply by the law of hereditary descent, but in virtue of an inexpiable crime committed by the first of the race and attributed to all who sprang from his loins. As all men were thus alienated from God, they were all justly exposed to the condemnation of his law. He, in his turn, was alienated from them, incensed against them, and cherished a settled intention of avenging Himself upon them by exposing them to an endless and depraving torture. But, to shew that He was rich in mercy, He either sent his Son, or permitted his Son to come to earth—not to eradicate the tendency to evil from

every heart, not to take away the guilt of the whole world, not to redeem the whole family of man to life everlasting, but to die, the just for the unjust, in order that the sins of those who should hereafter believe might be imputed to Him and that his righteousness should be imputed to them. By this transaction, this drama enacted in the days of time, and based in part at least on legal fictions, an eternal salvation was provided for the few, and the eternal condemnation of the many was vindicated afresh. God was enabled to reveal the exceeding riches of his grace to the elect, to the faithful, and was justified in pouring out the treasures of his wrath on the unfaithful, the reprobate, on as many, in fact, as had not been able or willing to conquer that tendency to evil with which they were born. In so far, therefore, as the salvation of Christ was an act of grace at all, it was regarded as exceptional, unparalleled, out of the usual course and method of the Divine activity; not as an instance and sample of that activity, not as a temporal manifestation of what was always in the mind and heart of God. Those who held and taught this view do not seem so much as to have suspected how opposed it was to their own conception of the character of God, although they saw clearly enough, and sometimes rejoiced to see, how utterly opposed it was to human reason, or, as they phrased it, how "*humbling* to the pride of reason." And yet, as there is nothing more consonant with reason than that, if there be a God, He must be eternally the same, so there was nothing they more surely believed. But if God be the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever, must not that which we see to

be true of Him at any time be true of Him at all times? Must He not have been yesterday, will He not be to-morrow and on every to-morrow, what we find Him to be to-day, and that even though to-day be the day of Christ's passion and death?

This was the point of departure for the new theology—new, and yet as old as St. Paul and St. John. Those who in our own time first gave it form translated the essential facts of the gospel out of time into eternity. They argued that if, when Christ came and dwelt among us, God delighted in men—delighted to dwell with them and teach them and comfort them—He always must have delighted Himself in them, and always will delight to dwell with them, and teach and comfort and redeem them. They argued that, if He then came to shew mercy on men, to take away their sins, to reconcile them to Himself, He always must have had mercy on them, and will always, in so far as they will permit Him, deliver them from their bondage to evil into the freedom of a loving obedience to his will. In fine, they argued—and, as it seems to me, argued with an irresistible logic—that in Christ the world was granted a momentary glimpse of what God *is* in Himself always and for ever; and that in the teaching and redemption of Christ the world was shewn, as in an instant of time, what God has been doing from the beginning and will do to all eternity.

Now if we view them in the light of this newer and yet older theology, the incarnation, the passion, and the resurrection of Christ appear no less conformable to reason than the life He led and the law He gave.

(1) Consider the Incarnation in this light for a moment. Men have always seen God in nature. In the several stages of their progress they have deified almost every natural force and production. But, as I have said, they have always longed to see, they have always felt their need of seeing Him in humanity, in order that they might be assured that He is not far from every one of us, that He is with us and within us, that we are in very deed his offspring. Proofs of this craving, this need, are to be found not only in "the fair humanities" worshipped in the temples of Greece and Rome, but in every literature of the many-languaged earth, even in the Bible itself. No moral law, however pure, would satisfy Job, for instance; no remote and obscure God, whom he could not see and grasp and apprehend. If that sublime poem teaches us anything, it teaches us that the nobler men are and the wiser, the more profoundly they need and long to see Him for themselves, to see Him humanized, that they may not be affrighted by his majesty, but talk with Him face to face as a man speaks with a friend. Is it not reasonable to believe that this yearning was gratified, this need met; that at least once in the ages of time the curtain, the glory, which hides God from us, was withdrawn for an instant, and withdrawn, not only that men might see God for the instant, but also that they might be sure that He is always with them?

Wise and good men are tormented by this profound and incessant craving, not because they long to indulge a merely speculative curiosity, but because they yearn to know what God's will really is. They are conscious of much in themselves that seems good

and fair; they can excogitate rules of life which seem to them worthy of obedience; but when they meet with men as good and wise as themselves, they find that the inward oracle can assume many voices, that it utters an uncertain sound; that, on some points, what seems right to them does not seem right to others. Even where they agree, is it not natural that they should long to hear some authoritative voice, a voice from Heaven, which shall sanction the utterances of their own moral sense? and where they differ, must they not much more long for such a voice of authority to end and determine the debate? Must it not be an infinite gain to them if they can ascertain that their conceptions of right and wrong are in harmony with the Supreme Will?

Viewed in this light, I am bold to say that the fact and doctrine of the Incarnation are in entire accord with human reason. If men, for ends so noble and momentous, needed to see God and to hear his voice, who can wonder that the Everlasting Word took flesh and dwelt amongst us, that men beheld in Him the glory of the Father, and gathered from his lips the law of truth and grace? Persuade me that no Incarnation has taken place, and you will but drive me to look for an Incarnation in the future, so sure am I that He who implanted in the human heart the instinct which craves Him, and the deep necessity which demands Him, *must* satisfy them in his own time and way.

(2) Nor, again, is the passion of Christ less reasonable than his incarnation. If we believe that there are or may be as many grades of life above us as there are beneath us; if we believe, as Science

insists we should believe, that the whole universe—physical, psychical, spiritual—is one, shaped by the same forces, ruled by the same laws, it does not become us to deny that the Atonement of Christ may have aspects and far-reaching influences—relations to the equity and universal throne of God—of which we can *know* nothing, although glimpses of such relations and influences are now and then reflected in the glass of the Word. It may be that, just as the man Job was singled out for a crucial test and experiment in order to demonstrate to the hierarchies of heaven that humanity is capable of an unselfish and disinterested virtue, so this world may have been singled out and made the theatre of the Divine tragedy of the Cross for the instruction of angels and principalities and powers in heavenly places. We cannot tell, or cannot fully tell. But there is one aspect of the Atonement of Christ, and that the most important to us as yet, which is well within our reach; and, in this aspect of it, it supplies a want of our nature as deep and universal as that supplied by the Incarnation. For if we and all men are conscious of a sympathy with righteousness which breeds a craving to have our conceptions of it verified or rectified by a Divine authority, we are also profoundly conscious that we have violated our own sense of right, and have thus brought guilt and shame into our souls. If we cannot hold it just that men should be damned with an irresistible tendency to sin, and then damned again because they did not resist it, it does not follow that we doubt either our responsibility or our guilt. The better a man is, indeed, and the loftier his conception of God and of

righteousness, the more profoundly he feels and mourns his sin, the more earnestly he craves to know that God's love "is more than all our sins," that "He, who best the 'vantage might have took, Himself found out the remedy."

Now this craving is met in the passion of Christ regarded as a revelation of the forgiving and cleansing love of God. If we detach and isolate the sacrifice of Christ, if we make it a mere event in time which affects only a certain select company of men no better than their fellows, reason revolts from it as wholly unlike, wholly irreconcilable with, the best conception it can frame of the character and rule of God. But if we take it simply as the crowning illustration of the love of God; if we remember that the self-sacrifice exhibited on the cross must be as eternal as God Himself; if we believe that the "agony and passion" were endured to shew us how far God would go, and how much He would do, to redeem men from their sins; then surely we may see it to be reasonable that such an exhibition of the Divine love and forgiveness should be made once for all to men burdened and trembling under the burden of sin. If such a sacrifice had not been made already, we might confidently expect it, since nothing short of it would meet the deep want of sinful men or fully disclose the mercy and love of God.

(3) And here, finally, we have reached a point at which *the resurrection* and ascension of Christ may be shewn to be as reasonable as his incarnation and passion. The longing for immortality, the hope of rising into an after-world in which all the wrongs of time shall be redressed, is as marked and profound

a feature in the heart and history of man as the sense of sin or the craving for righteousness. If this longing were a sentiment peculiar to Christian times, we might suspect its origin and question its validity. But there is no age of which we have clear historical records, and no noble upward-striving race of men, in which it may not be traced. There may be, as there may have been, men with so little manhood in them as to be unconscious of it; but, these apart, this longing, or its dark and ominous shadow, the *fear* of immortality, has been universal. And to what *are* we to trust, if not to these facts of universal consciousness, to these primitive and inbred instincts of the race?

But though the longing for immortality be so deep, so natural, so general, so well-defined, will any thoughtful man assert that it could be more than a longing, or at best a faint and flickering hope, until it was confirmed by the authority of One who had found a path of life even in the darkness of death? Will any such man affirm that it was unlike God to meet and satisfy a craving so profound, for a knowledge so essential to the welfare of the human race? To me, I confess, this supernatural event, the resurrection of Christ from the dead consummated by his ascension into heaven, seems most natural, most reasonable, if we regard it as the Divine sanction of man's craving for immortality, as at once the proof and the prophecy that death is but the point of transition from life to life. That we should know what we have to expect in the future is necessary to a wise use of the present. The senses make many and imperious claims upon us. The kingdoms of

this world and their glory make claims on us as many and as imperious. How shall we meet and resist their attractions, save as we yield to the mightier attractions of the inward and immortal world, the world that is ever coming and ever to come? That that world should be *revealed* to us was requisite, if we were to know it, or to know of it, in any definite and assured way; for no traveller has returned from beyond the bourn which every man must pass in turn, to tell us how it fared with him beyond the grave. And if it must be revealed, how could it have been revealed more nobly and more generously, and yet with a greater economy of miracle, than by the resurrection and on the authority of Him who died for us all and in whom we all died, and who rose and went up on high, that where He is there we might be also?

I do not profess, in this brief essay, to have glanced at all, or even at most, of the aspects in which the cardinal facts and verities of the Christian Faith need to be viewed, and ever re-viewed. That has not been my aim. I have tried rather to select those aspects of them in which they commend themselves to the inquisitive and sceptical intellect. And I am content if I have shewn that, even when the appeal is to Reason, much may be said for the leading supernatural facts in the life of our Lord—for his incarnation, his atoning death, and his resurrection from the dead. Men always have craved and always will crave to see God in man, to hear his voice confirming or correcting their fluctuating conceptions of duty and virtue; and in Christ He came to be seen of them, to give them "the law of truth,"

and to assure them that He is ever with them to guide them into ways of righteousness. Men have always been conscious of sins from which they could not detach and cleanse themselves; and in and by Christ God both made an atonement for their sins and shewed them that He is always striving to cleanse them from their guilt. Men have always yearned for an immortal life beyond the grave; and in Christ God has given them the assurance of a final and eternal victory over death. Was it not *reasonable* and *right* that He should thus graciously respond to the spiritual instincts and affections which He Himself had implanted in their hearts? And if it were reasonable and right, in what way could He more effectually and more conclusively have responded to them than in the incarnation, passion, and resurrection of Christ Jesus, his Son, our Lord.

Let us remember, however, that to admit the credibility, or even the truth, of these great historical facts will be of little avail, unless we permit them to become spiritual factors and powers in our lives. The incarnation of Christ only reaches its true end in us as it assures us that we too are the sons of God, only as it makes us the conscious and happy partakers of the Divine Nature. The passion of Christ only reaches its true end in us as it actually cleanses us from sin and quickens us to all righteousness. And the resurrection of Christ only reaches its true end in us as it both renders us tranquil amid all the changes, adversities, and wrongs of time, by the hope of life everlasting, and enables us, even now and here, to have our conversation in heaven.

S. COX.

THE HALACHA AND THE HAGADA.

ALL who have interested themselves in the endeavour to acquire any knowledge of the Talmud are aware that the Rabbis who have contributed to that strange and enormous encyclopædia of twelve folio volumes, fall into two schools—the Halachists and the Hagadists; and although an Halachist might occasionally indulge himself in Hagadôth, and a Hagadist might sometimes distinguish himself in the Halacha,[1] yet the distinction between the two schools is so radical, that we cannot advance a step until it is completely grasped and understood.

1. The origin, development, and intention of the HALACHA will, I think, be clear to any reader of my papers on the Oral Law in previous numbers of THE EXPOSITOR.[2] The word (of which the plural is Hilchôth or Halachôth) is derived from *Halak*, "to walk," and simply means a rule, a decisive tradition, "the ultimate conclusion on a matter long debated."[3] No system of laws, and above all no system so brief as the Mosaic legislation in its earliest form, could possibly include all the vast varieties of human circumstance; and since the law was regarded as infinitely sacred in its minutest regulations, it was

[1] For instance, R. Levi Ben Sisi tried to unite the Hagada and the Halacha, as R. Jochanan Ben Zakkai had tried to do before him. Hamburger, s. v. v. Agada and Jochanan. [2] February, March, and May, 1877.

[3] הלכה, Halachah. "Apud Rabbinos et Thalmudicos est constitutio juris, sententia, decisio, traditio decisa, et usu ac consuetudine recepta et approbata. Secundum quam incedendum et vivendum." Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.* s. v. He quotes from the Baal Aruc the somewhat enigmatic definition, "A matter which goes and comes from the beginning to the end,"—which apparently means that the Halacha does not consist of the various statements of the discussion, but is its authoritative conclusion.—Chiarini, *Théorie du Judaisme*, i. 62.

inevitable that questions should continually arise as to the proper method of understanding or applying it. If, in the nineteenth century after Christ, we have seen a powerful Church distressed and agitated by the archæological discussion of one or two rubrics dealing with matters so apparently unimportant as the position of a Communion Table and the use of half a dozen vestments, it is hardly to be wondered at that Judaism should be profoundly exercised by minutiæ which to them seemed far more important than the use of chasubles or the position of celebrants. Hence the *thorah shebeal pî*, or "law upon the lip,"—the Oral as distinguished from the Written Law—dates back to very early times. As far back as the later books of the Pentateuch we find decided traces of a growth from earlier and simpler regulations; and we see that, even in the wilderness, events from time to time occurred which necessitated some explanation of laws already promulgated. Such for instance is the scene between Moses and his nephews when he found that they had burnt instead of eating the goat of the sin offering;[1] the decision about the man caught gathering sticks[2] on the Sabbath day; the rule laid down by Eleazar the priest respecting the treatment of spoils of war;[3] the punishment of blasphemy;[4] and others. In later books we trace still further developments, as for instance in the consecration of altars; the laws relating to the monarchy; the entire regulations respecting the building and worship of the temple; the creation of schools of the prophets; of rules respecting the Sabbath;[5] of

[1] Lev. x. 16. [2] Num. xv. 32. [3] Ibid. xxxi. 21.
[4] Lev. xxiv. 11. [5] Jer. xvii. 21.

four yearly fasts;[1] of the three daily prayers.[2] In fact the Bible itself will furnish us with specimens of the five kinds of Halachôth—*written, oral, inferential, customary*, and *temporary*. These Biblical Halachôth are, however, perfectly insignificant when compared with the subsequent development of the system, during the five centuries which preceded, and the three which followed, the destruction of Jerusalem. These eight centuries are the epochs of the three great schools of Jewish teachers, which are known by the names of the SOPHERÎM, or Scribes; the earlier and later TANAÎM, or Authoritative Teachers; and the AMORAÎM, or Discoursers. In these schools originated the vast national literature and tradition which we call by the general name of the Talmud.

(1) The SOPHERÎM cover the period from Ezra to Simon the Just (B.C. 458–320), and to them we owe the reading of the Book of Esther at the feast of Purim; the morning and evening repetition of the *Shema Israel* (the prayer, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord!"); the rules about the construction of phylacteries; the public reading of the law in the worship of the synagogues; rules about forbidden marriages; and not a few of the simplest of those decisions and institutions which were afterwards collected in the Mishna. These institutions, sometimes known as the *Mishnalel shel Sopherîm*, consist partly of explanations of the written law, and partly of deductions from it, which are generally reasonable and fair, to meet cases with which it had not explicitly dealt.

(2) The period of the TANAÎM begins with the

[1] Zech. viii. 19. [2] Dan. vi. 10.

rise of a Sanhedrin and the disappearance of the Great Synagogue founded by Ezra. The name is derived from *Tana*, "to teach with authority."[1] The early part of the epoch of the Tanaîm is marked by the gradual rise of the Chasidîm and Tsedakîm, in which we have seen the germ of the later Pharisees and Sadducees; and we have already traced the sources of their activity in the mutual attractions and antagonisms between Hebraism and Hellenism, and the deepening necessity that every patriot who held a cosmopolitan spirit to be closely akin to apostasy should add to the impenetrability of that *hedge about the law* which it was the main object of their lives to plant. To the pre-Christian members of this Rabbinic epoch belong the famous couples (Zougôth):—

Jose Ben Joezer and Joseph Ben Jochanan;
Joshua Ben Perachia and Nitai of Arbela;
Jehuda Ben Tabbai and Simeon Ben Shetach;
Shemaia and Abṭalion;

and, lastly, the two whose diverging schools exercised so vast a subsequent influence, gave to the Talmudic discussions their sharp tone of opposition, and left so many traces of their conflicts in the Gospel narrative,[2] namely,

Hillel and Shammai,

[1] The phrases *Tanu Rabbanan*, "our Rabbis have taught;" *Tani chada*, "so and so has taught;" *Tanina*, "we have a tradition;" *Mathnitha*, "it is Mishna," are constant phrases of quotation from the *Barathijôth*, or supplements to the Talmud.—Etheridge, *Heb. Lit.* p. 179.

[2] As I have shewn in my "Life of Christ," *passim*. It was the complaint of some of the wiser Rabbis, that since the disputes of Hillelites and Shammaites had begun, the law had become like two laws; whereas in old days a simple majority of the Grand Sanhedrin had been sufficient to decide every question.—Chiarini, ii. 28. It is said that they originally differed in only three points.—Shabbath, xvii. 1.

the distinguished representatives of Judaism in its mildest breadth and its most virulent bigotry. To Hillel we probably owe the classification of the vast unwritten elements of the Mishna into the six Sedarîm, or orders, and the ancient nucleus which was subsequently enlarged into the twelve chapters of the famous *Megillath Taanith*, or Roll of Fasts. Hillel was succeeded by his son Simeon I., and then successively by his descendants, Gamaliel the Elder (Hazzaken) and Simeon and Jochanan Ben Zakkai, who founded the school of Jabne.[1] The later school of Tanaîm began after the destruction of Jerusalem, and continued for three hundred years after Christ, by which time the Mishna had been finally elaborated by Jehuda Hakkodesh (the Holy), emphatically called Rabbi, or Rabbenu,[2] and his immediate disciples.

(3) The AMORAÎM, from *amar*, "to discourse," held a less exalted position than their predecessors.[3] An eminent Amora was a *Tana bathra*, or "last teacher," as distinguished from a *Tana kama*, or genuine Rabbi of the Mishna. Now just as the period of the Tanaîm coincides with the rise and conclusion of the MISHNA, so that of the Amoraîm coincides with that of the GEMARA, and the Gemara stands in the same relation of commentary and supplement to the Mishna as the Mishna does to the Thorah, or law. The Mishna is the repetition of the law; the Gemara is the "completion" (*gemar*, "to perfect") of the Mishna, following the same six

[1] About A.D. 80–220.

[2] The Mechiltha of Ishmael Ben Elisha, a commentary (Midrash) in nine treatises (Mesiktôth) on Exodus xii.–xxiii. belongs to this epoch. He died A.D. 121. Jehuda died about A.D. 190.

[3] About A.D. 220–498.

orders, and composed of much the same elements, namely, quotations from the Law, Halachôth, Hagadôth, &c. The two together constitute the Talmud proper.[1]

Now the Gemara is very largely composed of discussions about minute points of ritual, often dealt with by contradictory decisions of the Rabbis, and further confused by wide varieties of custom. These discussions are given at length, and when the several Rabbis have argued, illustrated, or stated their views, the authoritative decision is given in the words, *The Halacha is with such anone.*

Let us take an instance—the first that comes to hand out of thousands—from the Bab. Berachôth (fol. 43, b).

"The Rabbis have taught, if one brings perfumed oil (for cleansing) and myrtles, one ought, according to Shammai, to bless first the oil, then the myrtles; according to Hillel, one does it in the inverse order. I am of the opinion of the former, said R. Gamaliel, because from oil one derives *two* sources of enjoyment, the odour and the anointing; while from myrtles one only derives the enjoyment of the sweet scent. This opinion, says R. Jochanan, serves for an Halacha. When R. Papa was at the house of R. Houna, son of R. Ika, they brought them perfumed oil and myrtles. He took some, and blessed *the myrtles before the oil.* 'Master,' they asked him, 'are you not of the same opinion on the subject of

[1] The Gemara contains many TOSEPHTÔTH (from *yasaph*, "to add"), or *appendices* to the Mishna; and many BARATHIJÔTH, or laws EXTRA to the Mishna (from *baria*, exterior). These are not authoritative unless they coincide with the Mishna; just as the TOSAPÔHTH, or additions by the later Rabbis to the Gemara, are not authoritative if they contradict the Gemara.

the Halacha which one ought to follow?' 'According to Raba,' said he, 'the opinion of Hillel serves as the Halacha.' This, however, is not the case, and he only said so to excuse his error."

Halachôth like these were part of the infinitely intricate network of protection adopted by Mosaism against foreign encroachments; and they were quite sufficient to occupy years of infructuous study, and to fill up every moment of the lives which they rendered so strenuously useless, so laboriously frivolous. They affected the minutest particulars of synagogue worship and the entire ritualism of feasts; they were mixed up with every province of family life; they even pervaded the whole national institutions. Some of them are so ancient that we find them distinctly established at the epoch of the Septuagint translators, who in not a few instances (*e.g.*, when they render Exodus xii. 15 by the *destruction*—αφανιεῖε—of all leaven; Exodus xiii. 6 by wearing the phylacteries *in front of*—πρὸ—the eyes; and Exodus xxii. 7 by an allusion to the custom of having found property *cried* —περὶ ἀπολειας τῆς ἐγκαλουμένης)[1] are even influenced by Halachôth in the manner of treating the sacred text by words which they alter and introduce. It was a remark of R. Ishmael, a Rabbi of the century after the destruction of Jerusalem, that in three instances the Halacha went beyond the written law,[2] viz., in the rules about covering the blood of a beast or fowl caught in hunting;[3] in the number of instruments with which the hair of a Nazarite might be cut; and the writing materials necessary for the "book" of

[1] *Frankl Vorstudien*, pp. 90, 95.
[2] *Sota*, f. 16, a. Hamburger Talm. Wörteil. l. v. Halacha.
[3] Lev. xvi. 13.

divorcement, where the Halacha permitted not only a *Sepher*, or "book," but even olive leaves. The Halacha went, however, as we have seen in a previous paper, much farther than this. It laid down extravagant rules about tithes, it abolished the drinking of the water of jealousy, and established Hillel's ingenious device of the *Prosbol*, to get rid of the commercial inconveniences of the Sabbatical year. Many of the Halachôth may have been inevitable, if any semblance of obedience to the law was to be preserved without utterly disturbing the conditions of life, completely as they had been altered by the course of the centuries which had elapsed since the legislation of the wilderness; but others of these "rules" were tyrannous and burdensome, and to this day continue to be a source of needless vexation to the most scrupulously orthodox among the Jews. And it would have been better in the first instance frankly to admit the principle of modifying the law—where the divinely-ordained circumstances of life rendered it obviously advisable to do so—rather than hypocritically to undermine it under pretence of profound reverence. It must have had a most injurious influence on the conscience of the Rabbis, and it must have stamped their religious convictions with a sense of unsatisfying hollowness, to profess that every curl and corner of a letter was sacred, and yet to deduce from them Halachôth which in a number of cases rendered the Law itself contradictory or obsolete.

We have now seen something of the growth, nature, and tendency of the Halachôth. They were the most essential parts of the Rabbinic *Seyag la-*

thorah;[1] they were the work of the religious understanding, and they tended more and more to crystallize the broad and symbolic institutions of the Mosaic legislation into a formalism at once deadening and meaningless. The Mishna itself consists to so great an extent of Halachôth, that in the Jerusalem Talmud it is called Halacha without further distinction.[2] And this would have been a logical distinction to observe between the Mishna and Gemara, seeing that many Rabbis regarded Hagadôth as mere unauthoritative illustrations, which should therefore have been excluded from the authoritative text. Hagadôth do, however, occur not only in the celebrated Pirke Abhôth, or "sayings of the Fathers," and Middôth, or "temple measurements," but, according to Zunz, in no less than twenty-six of the treatises of the actual Mishna.

2. Utterly different from the Halacha—different in character, different in scope, different in importance, different in estimation—is the HAGADA; and as our estimate of the Talmud must largely depend on our due appreciation of this great branch of it, which constitutes indeed the main part of the Gemara, we must now proceed to give some account of its nature and origin.

Hagada (in its Aramaic form, Agada, Agadtha) is a Hebrew word from the verb נגד "to say, relate,

[1] Hedge about the Law.

[2] Munk, *Berachôth*, p. xi. The Talmud Jerushalmi is the Mishna, with the Gemara of the Palestinian Amoraîm,—a school which consisted of such men as Chaia, Ben Chanina, Rav, Bar Kappara, and Abihu. The date of its completion is about A.D. 390. The Babylonian Talmud (Talmud Babli) is mainly due to the lectures of the celebrated R. Ashi (born 351, died 427), who thereby earned the title of Rabbana, as Jehuda Habhoded had earned that of Rabbenu, "our Rabbi," for his share in the Mishna. It was completed and sealed by R. Jose, A.D. 498.

explain," &c.[1] Generally speaking, it consists of narrative, legend, poetry, exegesis, instruction, allegory, and all the teaching on those branches of knowledge which have no immediate connection with orthodox practice.[2] It is in its widest sense the expression of religious feeling. If any one will examine the definitions of it proposed by Zunz, Frankl, Derenbourg, Ginsburg, &c., he will I think come to the conclusion that it might be represented in English by "Homiletic Literature."[3] This equivalent would especially apply to the Hagada in its original sense, as the word was used in the second and third centuries after Christ. It subsequently acquired a looser and more extensive meaning, in which it included the entire circle of scientific teaching; but originally nothing would have been called a Hagada which was not connected with (1) Exegesis, the translation and explanation of Scripture, and all such polemical and apologetic matters as arose out of it; 2. Ethics, illustrated by proverbs, exhortations, topics of warning and comfort, often conveyed in imaginative forms; 3. Dogma and ritual; 4. Mystic teaching, including the Kabbalistic methods of interpretation, the *Pardes* and *Geneth*, which we have already illustrated; 5. Prayers, poems, and emotional

[1] Hagada (אגדתא אגדה)—narratio, enarratio, historia jucunda et subtilis discursus historicus aut theologicus de aliquo loco scripturæ jucundus, animum lectoris attrahens.—Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.*

[2] I shall throughout make free use of Hamburger, and of the few others who have written on the subject with full knowledge.

[3] It might be thought that this corresponded more nearly to Midrashim, but the Midrashim consisted largely of Hagadôth. "Midrashim," says Ibn Ezra, "are of various kinds. Some of them are secret enigmas and sublimely exalted parables; others serve merely to refresh the fatigued understanding; others fill up the *lacunæ* of Scripture. Allegories are like robes—some cling to the body and are as fine as silk; others coarse as sackcloth," &c.

utterances in general. It falls into three forms, namely, the expository, which is simple and scientific; the allegoric and symbolical; and the hyperbolic. In these respects it bears a close analogy to Midrashic literature in general, and to modern sermons in particular; nor can we be surprised that its allegoric and hyperbolic branches, consisting of fables, legends, anecdotes, marvels, enigmas, and myths, has almost absorbed the notice accorded to the whole range of Hagadôth.

The study of the Halacha demanded severe efforts of memory, and its exposition to popular audiences was impossible without demanding close attention to dry, abstruse, and unpractical minutiæ. An enumeration of Halachôth would resemble a chapter out of a legal digest or a book of precedents; and if delivered in a religious assembly, would be like a sermon full of recondite arguments about albs and stoles. It is not at all astonishing that even the most staunch Halachists had to break their weary monologues by jests, appeals, exclamations, anecdotes, which would put them a little more on a level with their more popular Hagadic brethren. Thus R. Akibha, noticing on one occasion the somnolence of his auditors, suddenly woke them up by exclaiming, "*A woman in Egypt once bore* 600,000 *sons;*" and when he had thus startled his listeners into attention, proceeded to explain that he meant Jochebed, the mother of Moses, who renewed the youth of the people of Israel. The story resembles that of a modern preacher who once arrested the placid "folding of the hands to sleep" of an afternoon congregation by beginning his sermon with the

words, "A man was hanged at Tyburn last Friday;" and of another who suddenly shouted out, "Fire, fire!" and in answer to the alarmed inquiries of a congregation now thoroughly awake, quietly explained that he meant "in hell." In point of fact there is a great analogy between the oratorical touches and methods of the Hagadists and those adopted for the same general purpose by the preaching friars of the middle ages.

It is easy from these remarks to see that, though Rabbis so eminent as Jochanan Ben Zakkai, Joshua Ben Chananja, Ishmael, Akibha, Tarphon, Eliezer Ben Hyrkanos, were famous for their skill in the Hagada, it was a species of teaching which was liable to gross abuse, and one upon which, partly because of its extreme popularity, many Halachists would be likely to look with very jealous eyes.[1] On one occasion Akibha interrupted Pappus in the midst of his Hagada with the cry, "*Enough, Pappus!*" and he was himself more than once abruptly called to task. "*How long dost thou profane the Godhead?*" exclaimed R. Jose the Galilean. "*What hast thou to do with the Hagada? stick to the rules about the* Negaim (cleansings of lepers) and Ohaloth (purification of tabernacles)," said R. Eliezer Ben Azaria. "*Wrong, Akibha! angels don't eat,*" was the pithy interruption of R. Ishmael. On one occasion, when R. Neharai was telling an Hagada that the children of Israel had brought figs and pomegranates for their children from the depths of the Red Sea, R. Gamaliel could not refrain from uttering

[1] It was a Rabbinic proverb that דברי אגדה מושכים הלב—"The words of the Hagada attract the soul."

a contemptuous remark on his appetite for the marvellous.

But since the Hagada itself is so comprehensive a term, and the adoption of its methods might be either sober and interesting or audacious and absurd, it is hardly to be wondered at that the opinions of the Rabbis about it were very various. When R. Jizchak, in the third century, complained that people were more eager to listen to it than to the Mishna, R. Levi apologetically observed that, in old days, when the Jews were wealthy, they could study the Halacha, but that now, in their poverty and subjection, they needed the consoling and inspiriting brightness of the Hagada. "The Hagada," said R. Abbahu, "is like the wares which every one can afford to buy." It was in fact the small change of religious teaching.[1] Its allegories were intended partly to explain, partly to conceal; its enigmas were meant to shroud sacred mysteries;[2] its lively sallies were meant to relieve the severity of Halachic teaching, so that a modern theologian compared the Hagadôth of the *Siphrî* to wine that refreshes the heart.[3] Maimonides regarded them as all meant to convey a hidden sense, which he says shines like gold through a silver covering,—quoting Proverbs xxv. 11, "A word spoken upon wheels (E.V. 'fitly spoken') is like apples of gold in pictures of silver." In this aspect the most rigid Halachist need have felt no jealousy of the Hagada, and the soft answer of R. Abbahu, the Hagadist, to the jealousy of R.

[1] Chiarini, *Théorie du Judaisme*, ii. 53.

[2] Maimonides, More Nebhochim.

[3] Beer, *Gesch. des Unterrichts*. 285. Prag. 1832. The Siphrî is a commentary on Numbers and Deuteronomy.

Chija, the Halachist—who was angry at the greater number of his listeners — was excellent in its modesty and spirit.[1] "A seller of jewels," he said, "has fewer customers than a seller of fuseaux"—not, as Rashi observes, that the Hagada is necessarily less valuable than the Halacha, but that R. Abbahu wished to soothe the wounded self-love of R. Chija, though his own anecdotes were worth the subtilties of the other.

There can be no doubt that the Hagadôth in their Demonology, and in other subjects of which they dealt, descended very low, and must be branded not only with silliness, but even with prurience and obscenity. And this perhaps is one of the reasons why some of the Rabbis both hated and denounced the Hagada,[2] looking on those who taught it as, at the best, imaginative and ignorant dilettanti, but sometimes even as veiled apostates and secret favourers of heresy; a scorn which the Hagadists repaid by contemptuous allusions to the dry-as-dust minutiæ and hair-splitting pedantries of the rival school. While some sentences of praise may be quoted from the Talmud, the condemnations of the Hagada are more decisive. "Obviously," said R. Jonathan, "we teach no Hagadôth to the men of the south, because of their pride; or to the Babylonians, because of their ignorance of the law." Speaking of the lower class of Hagadôth — those which are called "disgraceful" (*Hagadôth shel dôphî*), R. Joshua Ben Levi said that it was profitless to invent, and a

[1] *Sota*, f. 40, a (Chiarini, i. 275).

[2] There are other and very remarkable reasons, with which I must deal elsewhere. The differences between the Halachic and Hagadic schools were very deeply seated.

waste of time to listen to them; and R. Seira angrily called the Hagadistic books "books of sorcery;" and when asked the reason for his indignation, said, "Ask the books themselves, and they will tell you."

I have already noticed the fact that the Jews themselves hold different opinions about the Hagada, some of them regarding its more extravagant developments with natural and undisguised contempt; others, like Maimonides, seeing the possibility of allegoric explanation. It is even said that Maimonides intended to write a work which should do for the Talmudic Hagadôth the same service that his More Nebhochim was intended to do for the difficulties of the Bible. The intention, however, was not carried out, and if Maimonides had ever seriously faced the task he would probably have found it impossible or valueless. Here and there no doubt a meaning may be deciphered beneath the wild absurdities of Oriental fancy; but in many instances the attempt to turn the Hagadôth into consistent allegory would be about as foolish as the Christian explanation of the Iliad by the monk in the *Gesta Romanorum*, where Helen figures as the soul and Paris as the devil. The great Moses Ben Maimon has, however, left his opinion on record when he quotes a passage from the Talmud, in which the Rabbis say that just as if a person loses in his house a pearl or a piece of money, and lights a farthing candle and finds it, so parables are in themselves valueless, but by their means we get to understand the words of the Law.[1]

[1] More Nebhochim, Pref. He proceeds to apply his principle to Prov. xxv. 11, Gen. xxviii. 12, &c., and makes some very sensible remarks about not pushing the explanation into all details.

In the forty-third chapter of his Third Part he makes an interesting allusion to Rabbinic allegories. "Our Rabbis," he says, "take great delight in allegories, and make frequent use of them, *not because they think that this is the mind and sense of Scripture*, but to delight the reader, and by way of pleasant enigma." He proceeds to say that those who ridicule them as a mere distortion of the meaning of Scripture, and those who attribute to them a traditional and Kabbalistic value, are equally mistaken, their true character being enigmatical. Thus when R. Kappara explains Deuteronomy xxiii. 13 to mean (by reading אָזְנָךְ for אֲזֵנָךְ) that a man ought to put his finger in his ear when he hears anything impure, it would be astonishing if that great Talmudist meant to imply that Moses meant "finger" by "paddle," and "ears" by "weapon," but he merely uses an elegant allusion or enigma to convey a wise warning; and this is the meaning of all the allegoric explanations where you are told *to read not so-and-so but so-and-so.*[1] He himself explains the four kinds of boughs which the Jews were ordered to carry at the Feast of Tabernacles (Lev. xxiii. 40) as a sign of joy for the departure from the desert, seeing that they combine beauty, scent, and vitality, and are yet easily procurable, rejecting the allegoric meaning supplied by the Rabbis. "Beware," he says in another place,[2] "that you take not these words of the Hachîmîm literally, for this would be degrading to the sacred doctrine, and sometimes to contradict it. Seek rather the hidden sense, and if you cannot

[1] אל תקוא כך אלא כך. See Eisenmenger. Entd. Judenth. I. viii.
[2] Pherush Hammishnaioth (Etheridge, p. 183).

find the kernel leave the shell alone, and confess, 'I cannot understand this.'"

But modern Jews for the most part freely admit, with Professor Hurwitz in the Introduction to his Hebrew Tales, that "the Talmud contains many things which every Jew must sincerely wish had never appeared there, or should at least long ago have been expunged from its pages. . . . Some of these Agadatha are objectionable *per se*, others are indeed susceptible of explanations, but without these are calculated to produce false and erroneous impressions. Of the former description are all those extravagances relating to the extent of Palestine, the dimensions of Gehinom, the size of Leviathan and the *shor habar*, the freaks of Ashmodai, &c., idle tales, borrowed most probably from the Parthians and Arabians, to whom the Jews were subject before the promulgation of the Talmud."[1] He accounts for their preservation by the extraordinary intensity of that spirit of hero-worship which led the Jews to attach extravagant importance to anything which any Rabbi had said. Like most educated Jews who are not steeled by invincible prejudices, he admits that the Talmud contains many errors, contradictions, and weaknesses (as was indeed inevitable in a heterogeneous encyclopædia of civil law, natural science, and religious precedent); but he does not hesitate to avow his doubts whether there exists any uninspired work of equal antiquity that contains more interesting, more various and valuable information, than that of the still existing remains of the Hebrew sages. That these remains are indeed profoundly

[1] Ap. Etheridge, p. 184.

interesting and of inestimable value, we admit; and I may express my individual conviction that the gain of mastering them would well deserve the life's devotion of a Christian scholar. But this interest and value are not at all, or only to a very small extent, intrinsic, but almost exclusively archæological and historic. There is little or nothing in the way of elevating thought or moral teaching in the Talmud, which may not be acquired with infinitely greater ease, and in infinitely greater abundance, elsewhere. To represent the Talmud as a great storehouse of literary and ethical gems, is simply to throw dust in the eyes of the credulous. It is in reality a huge rubbish heap, containing indeed some few gems—already widely known and easily procurable — but far fewer than are contained in any literature of such enormous extent.

Resemblances between Christian and Rabbinic teaching have often been paraded. It is hardly surprising that they should exist when we remember the date of the completion of the Mishna and Gemara, so many generations after the death of Christ. There is more beauty and poetry in a single book of Homer, I had almost said in a single ode of Horace, than in the entire Mishna. There is, transcendently, more wisdom and depth in a single chapter of St. John or St. Paul, than in all the folio volumes of the Talmud put together. And yet the heap of what time has now reduced to rubbish was not always equally worthless, and it is now worth study as a strange and instructive memorial of an obsolete past. The Kjökken-mödings of Denmark are of no value, yet what a light have they thrown on the condition

of vanished races! The value of the Talmud consists, not in what it says, but in the light which it throws upon the character of Judaism and the dawn of Christianity. The Talmud has been much misunderstood, mainly from a mistaken view respecting the Hagadôth, of which I have just been speaking. In one further paper I hope to unfold some of their peculiarities and secrets, and must then leave the subject in far abler and better hands, content if I have in any way called attention to its importance.

FREDERIC W. FARRAR.

NOTE.—I am glad to take this opportunity of calling attention to the Talmudic labours of Mr. P. J. Hershon, who has published (in Hebrew) an edition of the Book of Genesis, accompanied by exclusively Rabbinic commentaries. So few are able to read Rabbinic Hebrew, that a translation of this valuable work has been undertaken by the Rev. M. Wolkenberg, and will shortly be published. Mr. Hershon has a similar work on Exodus ready for publication, if he receives sufficient encouragement, and it is of such extreme importance that the Talmud should be better known, that I can only express a hope that his labours may meet with the encouragement which they deserve.

III.

THAT CHRIST SPOKE GREEK.

THE next portion of the New Testament which claims our special consideration is the Epistle to the Hebrews. Taking for granted that the writing is a true epistle, and not a dissertation, and that its original language was Greek, and not Hebrew—both of which points are unanimously agreed upon by modern critics—we have to inquire to what *readers* it was originally addressed. This question has an obvious and important bearing on the controversy respecting the language then prevalent in Palestine.

Now, on looking into the Epistle itself, we seem at once to find satisfactory evidence of the justness of the conclusion naturally suggested by the title (*πρὸς Ἑβραίους*), that it was sent, in the first instance, to the inhabitants of the Holy Land. The familiarity which it presupposes, on the part of its readers, with the temple services, and with the whole enactments of the Levitical economy, as well as the danger which it constantly assumes they were in of attaching an undue importance to the peculiarities of Judaism, harmonize exactly with the belief that the Epistle was originally addressed to Palestine. And this accordingly has, in spite of one great difficulty to be immediately noticed, been the opinion of the vast majority of Biblical scholars. The ancients with one voice acquiesced in this conclusion. Clement of Alexandria, Jerome, Chrysostom, and others, all suppose the Epistle to have been addressed to the Christians of Palestine. And

in our own times, Hug, Tholuck, Bleek, Delitzsch, with many other eminent scholars, are of the same opinion. The whole complexion of the Epistle is generally felt to be such as necessarily suggests that it was at first intended for such readers as Palestine, or more properly Jerusalem, could alone specially produce; and particular allusions, such as that found in Chapter xiii. 12 (ἔξω τῆς πύλης), seem to lead naturally to the same conclusion.

But then, this Epistle having been written in *Greek*, how could it have been addressed to the inhabitants of Palestine, or still less, specifically to those of Jerusalem? Was not Aramaic their ordinary language, and could they have understood any other? Or, supposing that Greek was, to some extent, intelligible to them, would any one, who desired to obtain a favourable hearing from them, have addressed them in that language? Surely, their vernacular tongue would have been employed in such a case as that of our Epistle, which must, on many accounts, from its obvious purpose and express declarations, have been peculiarly distasteful to them; and we must therefore conclude that the Hebrews here addressed were not the inhabitants of Palestine, but some other community of Jewish Christians, to be sought for in a different part of the world.

Such is the great difficulty which has weighed with many modern critics, and induced them, in defiance of some very obvious considerations, to look about for some other body of Judaic Christians, to whom the Epistle might be supposed to have been addressed, than the Church in Palestine. The various devices which have been tried to escape the

difficulty require little more than to be stated in order to be condemned. In ancient times most of the Fathers avoided the perplexity which has been felt in modern times by first supposing, and then asserting, that the Epistle was not originally written in Greek, but Hebrew. Finding this hypothesis plainly negatived by the phenomena presented in the Epistle itself, recent writers have been reduced to great straits. Moses Stuart finds a sort of refuge in the idea that the Hebrews addressed were those of Cæsarea. He cannot deny that the writing bears evident marks of having been intended for Palestinian Christians; but as Jerusalem, according to the common view, could not have furnished readers capable of understanding it, he has recourse to the political capital of Judæa, as a place in which the Greek tongue may be admitted to have been well understood. Conybeare and Howson, again, argue that "a letter to the Church of Palestine would surely have been written in the language of Palestine;" and think that, while this consideration above all others serves "to negative the hypothesis that this Epistle was addressed to a Church situated in the Holy Land," there are several circumstances connected with it which "point to another Church for which we may more plausibly conceive it to have been intended, namely, that of Alexandria." And Dean Alford expresses himself against the Palestinian designation of the Epistle on various grounds, among which we find the following:—"Not only is our Epistle Greek, but it is such Greek as necessarily presupposes some acquaintance with literature, some practice not merely in the colloquial, but in the schol-

astic Greek of the day. And this surely was as far as possible from being the case with the Churches of Jerusalem and Palestine." He is led therefore, for this among other reasons, to deny that the Hebrews of our Epistle were the inhabitants of the Holy Land; and by a chain of reasoning which few readers, if any, will deem satisfactory, he appears to himself to find them among the Jewish Christians of Rome.

Such are some specimens of the mazes of speculation in which Biblical critics have been involved, by supposing that it was necessary to seek for the readers specially addressed in this Epistle somewhere out of Jerusalem. On the one hand, it is obvious that none but Judaic Christians could have been primarily in the eye of the writer, and that the designation which the Epistle bears on its front, as well as several of the references which it contains, seem to point naturally to the Church of Palestine. But, on the other hand, the Epistle is written in Greek, and that of such a kind as to argue familiarity with that tongue on the part of its readers; and the Old Testament quotations are taken from the Septuagint, even when that version differs materially from the Hebrew. These facts excite no surprise and create no difficulty if the conclusion for which I plead be admitted. On the contrary, they harmonize with it exactly, and readily lend their aid to illustrate and confirm its correctness. But on the common supposition as to the prevailing language of Palestine at the time, the facts which have been mentioned prove exceedingly troublesome; and being felt to be incompatible with the belief that

the inhabitants of Jerusalem could have been intended as the primary recipients of this Epistle, they necessitate a search for the persons specially addressed in some other portion of the world.

Now, as experience has proved, it is certainly a very difficult thing to find a community of Christians anywhere outside of Palestine to whom the Epistle can, with any preponderating probability, be viewed as having been originally sent. Every Church, almost, which had any connection with Paul and his associates, has been fixed upon by different writers. Various lists of these may be found in the critical works on our Epistle, and are so comprehensive as pretty nearly to exhaust the geographical notices which appear in apostolic history. The following is the list presented by Alford: "Wall believed the Epistle to have been written to the Hebrew Christians of proconsular Asia, Macedonia, and Greece; Sir I. Newton, Bolten, and Bengel, to Jews who had left Jerusalem on account of the war, and were settled in Asia Minor; Credner, to those in Lycaonia; Storr, Mynster, and Rinck, to those in Galatia; Lyra and Ludwig, to those in Spain; Semler and Nösselt, to those in Thessalonica; Böhme, to those in Antioch; Stein, to those in Laodicea; Röth, to those in Antioch; Baumgarten-Crusius, to those at Ephesus and Colosse." It can scarcely be said that any one of these hypotheses possesses much advantage, in point of evidence, over the others. As their variety suggests, they have been adapted more from caprice than on any solid grounds of argument. Nor is it necessary to spend time in proving that the original destination of the Epistle could not have been either

Rome or Alexandria. The totally discrepant pictures given of the Roman and Hebrew Christians [1] sufficiently discredit the one hypothesis; while the fact that the converts in Alexandria were, in every sense of the word, *Hellenists*, is enough to set aside the other.

We rest, therefore, in the ancient opinion that this Epistle was addressed to the Jewish Christians in Palestine. In maintaining this position, I do not of course mean to assert that the Epistle was intended to be confined to any particular Church. Like all the other Epistles, it was meant to have an encyclical character, and to possess an enduring value. But this has no influence on the question now under consideration. That question simply is, Who were its *original* readers? And the answer which, following ancient testimony and internal evidence, I give to that question is, that it was primarily addressed to the Church in Jerusalem. But then we must of course believe that its author wrote in a tongue which he was sure his readers well understood; and thus we are again led by this Epistle to reassert very emphatically the proposition that Greek was then *thoroughly familiar* to all the inhabitants of Palestine.

I now proceed to subject the view for which I contend to a sort of cross-examination. There are several phenomena presented in the New Testament which have been felt perplexing, if not inexplicable, on the opinion which has generally prevailed as to the language usually employed by the Saviour and

[1] *Cf.* Rom. xv. 14 with Heb. v. 11, 12.

his followers; and I desire now to employ these both as tests and evidences of the opposite theory, which it has been my endeavour to establish. The decisive proof of the validity of any hypothesis is that it explains *all* the phenomena in question. As Aristotle has remarked, "Everything connected with a subject harmonizes with the truth regarding it;" [1] and if we have, in fact, reached the truth respecting the point under discussion, we may justly expect that difficulties otherwise formidable will vanish when set in the light of it, and that, through its means, problems will be easily solved which remain insoluble on any erroneous hypothesis.

There is, then, one great difficulty which has been felt and acknowledged by some of those able and candid scholars who hold that Aramaic was the only language with which natives of Palestine could properly be said to be familiar at the time referred to; and that is, how to account for the very considerable command of Greek possessed by all the writers of the New Testament, and by some of them more than others. The idea, long prevalent, of ascribing this to a miraculous interposition, is now, as was formerly remarked, universally abandoned. And the question then comes to be how a man like St. James, for example, who never, apparently, left Palestine all his life, should have been able to write such Greek as is found in the Epistle bearing his name. The diction and style of that Epistle are admitted, on all hands, to make a comparatively near approach to the classical models of Greek composition. Expressing the opinion which exists on this point among Biblical

[1] *Nic. Eth.* i. 8.

critics, Dean Alford remarks: "The Greek of our Epistle is peculiar. It is comparatively free from Hebraisms; the words are weighty and expressive; the constructions for the most part those found in the purer Greek." And he adds: "*The Greek style of this Epistle must ever remain, considering the native place and position of its writer, one of those difficulties with which it is impossible for us now to deal satisfactorily.*"

The sentence which I have printed in italics contains a candid admission of the difficulty which the style of this Epistle presents to every one who holds the prevalent views with respect to the relation then subsisting between the Greek and Hebrew languages in Palestine. To all who agree with the eminent writer quoted, that Aramaic was the prevailing language of the country, the problem which is suggested by the Greek diction of this Epistle of James must remain, as he frankly confesses, one of which it is hopeless to attempt the solution.

But should not the very fact of such a difficulty being felt, on the ground assumed by Alford and others, lead them to doubt whether, in standing where they do, they may not be in error? The hypothesis which they maintain with respect to the knowledge of Greek then possessed by the inhabitants of Palestine is one which must be tested by facts, and it confessedly fails when set face to face with some of them. But surely, if the philosopher of old could say that "there is in *nature* nothing interpolated, or without connection, as in a bad tragedy," we may as confidently affirm that there is nothing in *Scripture* which is really out of harmony with the circumstances

in which the inspired writings were composed. And when this Epistle of James, on being appealed to in evidence either of the validity or unsoundness of that opinion which is generally held as to the knowledge of Greek then possessed by the natives of Palestine, is found to declare against those who maintain it, ought not that fact of itself to suggest a doubt whether they may not possibly be mistaken? Under the pressure of that difficulty which they acknowledge to be connected with this Epistle, may they not, without offence, be asked to reconsider their position, and to inquire whether there be not another way of looking at the point in question, by which all the facts of the case become easily explicable, and no residuum of unexplained difficulty remains to perplex and baffle the critical student.

That the position maintained in these papers entirely neutralizes every such difficulty, is too obvious to need any lengthened remarks. On the ground which I have assumed, and sought to make good, nothing could be more natural than that even the Palestinian James should write in the style which characterizes his Epistle. He lived in a country where the Greek tongue was constantly employed. On almost all public occasions he used it himself and heard it used by others, In the civil transactions taking place between the Romans as masters and the Jews as subjects, the language of Greece could alone furnish a common medium of intercourse; while in the ecclesiastical courts held under the presidency of the high-priest in Jerusalem, and in the Christian assemblies which met in the same city, with the Apostle himself at their head, we have

seen that the same tongue was habitually employed. In these circumstances, James could not fail to acquire a large acquaintance with that noble language. Continual use may easily be believed to have given him such a command of it as appears in his Epistle; and his very permanency in one settled sphere of labour would afford him an opportunity, which the other apostles did not possess, of becoming acquainted with some of the literary treasures which it contained. It seems, indeed, too plain to be disputed that James had read at least the works of some of the learned Jewish writers of the religio-philosophical school of Alexandria; and he could not have been familiar with the almost classical writings of Philo, without contracting some of that purity and polish by which they are so remarkably distinguished, and which are, in fact, so apparent in his own very elegant Epistle.[1]

I next observe that the very *existence* of what is known as the Hellenistic dialect of Greek seems to point to, and certainly fits in exactly with, the conclusion which is here sought to be established. A somewhat futile disputation was formerly carried on among scholars respecting the Greek of the New Testament. As the controversy was conducted between two such illustrious scholars as Salmasius and Heinsius, it may now be clearly seen to have been a mere strife about words. No one can read the Greek New Testament without perceiving that it is written in a peculiar kind of Greek. He may, indeed, refuse to allow that it ought to be styled

[1] Credner, a most competent authority remarks, "In der That zeigt unser Brief des Jacobus vielfache Berührung mit den Schriften Philos."—*Einl.* sec. 219.

a *dialect* in the same sense in which that term is applied to those varieties of language which were employed in different parts of Greece and her dependencies; but that it had its own characteristics, as much as any of the recognized dialects of classical Greek, is evident from the slightest inspection of the Gospels and Epistles. Not more manifestly does Herodotus differ from Xenophon or Theocritus from Sophocles, than St. Matthew or St. Peter differs from all. Now, how did this peculiar dialect arise? and how did it come to be so largely used, that we have many more writings extant in it than we possess in some of the classical dialects of the Greek language? Allow the common view as to the prevailing language of Palestine at the time of Christ to stand, and these questions appear to admit of no answer. Aramaic, it is said, was *the* language of the country, and Greek was but little used or understood. How then, I ask, did the dialect employed by the human authors of the New Testament arise? and how did it reach that maturity which manifestly appears in their use of it? Could the employment of Greek by a few scholars, accustomed for the most part to write in Hebrew, have led to its existence and cultivation? It is not thus that dialects are usually formed. They spring up, not in the libraries of the few, but in the homes of the many—not from the practice of learned and elaborate writers, but from the rough and ready utterances of those who meet at church or market, and are there accustomed to address each other in language which is naturally tinged by national characteristics and habits. No sort of *saltus* could possibly have been made by Jews

addicted to the almost exclusive employment of the Hebrew language, to the use of such Greek as appears in the New Testament. The very fact, therefore, that the inspired writings exhibit such a formed and distinct species of diction seems of itself necessarily to presuppose the general and long-continued use of the Greek language among the people.

But it may be said that the dialect in question was founded upon the Septuagint; and we may, in a certain sense, admit that this was the case. There can be no doubt, I believe, that all the sacred writers were thoroughly familiar with the LXX., and that its style had no little influence on the diction which they themselves employed. But I cannot allow that a mere acquaintance with the Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures furnishes any adequate explanation of the point under consideration. If, indeed, it be acknowledged that the Septuagint was in such constant use among the inhabitants of Palestine, as to form in fact the Bible which they habitually read, all is granted for which I contend; and I care not to discuss the question whether this common use of the LXX. implied, on other grounds, the existence of the dialect under consideration, or was itself the means of giving it currency throughout the country. But if it be said that Matthew and John and Paul wrote in the peculiar Greek exemplified in their works, simply because they followed the model presented by the Septuagint, I must deny the sufficiency of the cause assigned. The studied imitation of the style of a work not generally read in the country could never have given rise to the dialect which we find to have so generally prevailed,

even though it were possible to suppose that sufficient motive otherwise existed to lead to such a studied imitation. The influence of the LXX. may have been strongly felt by the New Testament writers, but certainly could not have induced or enabled them to compose their works in the diction which these exhibit, had not that, on other grounds, been the character of the language which they habitually employed.

Besides, it is certain that the Septuagint was universally employed by the Jews of Egypt, yet the Judaic writers of that country were very far from either designedly or unconsciously imitating its style. Philo, as is well known, depended entirely for his knowledge of the ancient Scriptures upon the Greek translation, yet his writings are framed on the classical, not the Hellenistic, model; and the same thing is true of the fragments which have come down to us of other Judæo-Egyptian writers belonging to this period. Palestine alone can be said to be the country in which the dialect exhibited in the New Testament flourished; and the vigorous existence of such a dialect in the days of Christ and his apostles can only reasonably be accounted for on the ground that it was then the prevailing public language of the people.

In what language, I shall now venture to inquire, was the hymn of the Virgin Mary (Luke i. 46–55) originally composed? No doubt some will scarcely have patience for a moment to consider this question, but will at once reply that it was, of course, in Hebrew. Nevertheless, that is not by any means certain: on the contrary, probability strongly inclines

to the other side. It has been noted by some of those who never saw their way to those views which it is my endeavour to establish, that the beautiful song of the mother of our Lord is made up of "entirely Septuagintal expressions."[1] On this ground they have actually felt themselves constrained to believe that Greek and not Hebrew was the tongue which Mary employed, while at the same time they continued to hold that her Divine Son, in the exercise of his public ministry, habitually made use of the Hebrew language! The incongruity of these two statements must, I think, be obvious to the reader. If there is really ground to believe that the Virgin, even in giving utterance in private to those feelings excited within her by the Holy Ghost, made use of Greek, much more must we suppose that this was true of the Saviour in the delivery of his public discourses. Let the *Magnificat* be carefully and candidly examined, and if it is found to bear clear internal evidence of having been originally composed in Greek—as even learned opponents of my views have admitted—then it seems impossible to deny, without utter inconsistency, that Greek was perfectly familiar at the period in question to the inhabitants of Palestine, and would, as a matter of course, be generally made use of by our Lord and his disciples.

I only add that Scripture is consistent to the end with that view of the linguistic condition of Palestine at the time which is here set forth. For, surely, it fits in well with the conclusion we have so often reached, when the exalted Saviour is represented in

[1] Grinfield's "Apology for the Septuagint," p. 185.

the Book of Revelation as making use emblematically of the letters of the Greek alphabet. In three several passages of that book (Chaps. i. 8; xxi. 6; xxii. 13) the expression is used by our Lord,—"I am Alpha and Omega (*Α καὶ Ω*), the beginning and the end, the first and the last!" Now there is certainly nothing impossible in the supposition that the corresponding Hebrew form of this figurative description was, in point of fact, made use of by Christ; and that, as Grotius has observed, "Joannes eam locutionem aptavit ad alphabetum Græcum, quia ipse Græce scribebat." But it can hardly be shewn that the analogous Hebrew form of expression was in use among the Jews of our Saviour's day. It seems also, as Diodati has remarked, to have been the habit of John to insert the Hebrew terms which were, at any time, employed by those to whom he listened in these apocalyptic visions, as well as to give their Greek equivalents (Comp. Chaps. ix. 11 and xvi. 16); and it cannot, at all events, be denied that it is more easy and natural to regard the Greek expressions now referred to as having been actually employed by our Lord; and, as no sufficient reason can be suggested for his having adopted this form of speech, except on the supposition that Greek had been generally employed by Him and his disciples, we find again, in the passages under remark, an additional corroboration of the truth of the proposition already so abundantly confirmed, that He and they did, for the most part, make use of the Greek language.

A. ROBERTS.

PRAYER.[1]

THE words of our Saviour, "Not my will, but thine, be done!" are a prayer, and the highest form of all prayer. They express a desire on the part of our Lord, which was, in reality, the deepest in his heart.

Desire is the *soul* of prayer. Invocation is but, so to speak, a befitting forerunner. So is adoration. Invocation and adoration go naturally abreast, but before. They are not, indeed, absolutely initial acts. They react. They are responsive to the appeal which is involved in the universal revelation that is made of Himself by God. Thanksgiving too, and the confession of sin—another pair of the moral responses of the soul—constitute, in the case of beings who have forfeited their right to blessedness, but who are nevertheless "crowned with tender mercies," appropriate concomitants of prayer. *But prayer itself is the uplifting of desire to God.* It is "asking," that we may receive;—"seeking," that we may find;—"knocking" at the door of infinite grace, that we may get in.

It is of the greatest moment to bear in mind that prayer *is the uplifting of desire*, and *nothing else is prayer*. No amount of supplicatory word-grinding is of the nature of prayer. No amount of solemn toning is of the nature of prayer. No mere reading of David's prayers, or Paul's prayers, or any other man's prayers, is prayer. No mere hearing of

[1] This paper was written at the same time, and on the spur of the same occasion, as the Essay on Prayer, by Carpus, which appeared in THE EXPOSITOR for May, June, July, and August. It reaches the same conclusions, by similar processes of thought. I gladly insert it, however, as a singular and valuable confirmation of the views already advocated in this Magazine.—EDITOR.

prayer is prayer. No mere utterance of the words that are the appropriate vehicles of prayer is prayer. Without desire, there *can be no real prayer to any being*. Without desire lifted up to God, there *can be* and there *is* no real prayer to God.

When this one simple idea of the essential nature of prayer is held up steadily in view, it not only reveals itself by its own light,—it dissipates, like a torch, when shook and shining, some of the shadowy notions that have been, for some time past, brooding like a nightmare on the public mind.

A grave proposal, for instance, was a few years ago launched into public consideration, under the auspices of a distinguished London physicist, in reference to a quantitative test of the efficacy of prayer. It was alleged that this quantitative test might be obtained by having different hospitals, or different wards of the same hospital, put into different relations to prayer. Let all the patients, it was suggested, receive, as far as possible, not only impartial but identical treatment, so far as medical attendance and attention are concerned. Let one half, however, of the number be made the special objects of the unceasing prayers of the pious, while the other half are left out, as far as practicable, from the sweep of all specialty of prayer. It would then, it was contended, be ascertainable, after a sufficient length of testing time had elapsed, whether, and to what extent, any real efficacy is attributable to prayer. Such was the proposal.

Now we do not for a moment impugn the sincerity and good faith of the scientific investigators who propounded or commended this quantitative gauge or

test. But the proposal, nevertheless, is based on an entire misapprehension of *the real nature of prayer.* If prayer had been mere mechanical reading out of a book, or the mere mechanical utterances, without book, of certain forms or formularies of petition, then, indeed, it would be extremely easy to draw a line between certain wards or hospitals on one little spot of space, and certain others out in the dark on another, and to get some sort of human machines to grind out, in relation to the one sphere and not in relation to the other, the requisite amount of eucho-logical phraseology. If prayer be mere words, the test is practicable. But if prayer be not the mere words of the lips, but the uplifting to God of the desires of the heart, how could any man, who really goes to God at all with his desires, deny them to the one half of those who are the undistinguished objects of the Divine benignity and mercy? How could religious men deliberately stint their compassions—the real material of their prayers—in the presence of Him whom they know to be no respecter of persons, but good unto all, and lavish of his tender mercies over all his works? How could they importune the God of universal love to be a respecter of persons? Even the scientific gentlemen themselves, to whose proposal I am referring, would not be able, I believe, to limit the sympathetic desire of their hearts to the poor patients in the one set of wards. Brace themselves as they might, and let them exert themselves as much as ever they could to put the screw on their hearts, and shut down the sluice on their compassions, that the streams might be dammed up or diverted, their desire would flow over, in spite of themselves,

to the occupants of the pretermitted wards. *And, if they but knew it, that sympathetic desire in their hearts is rudimentary prayer.*

We turn now to another shadow that has been projected on the subject of prayer. It has been contended that petition should be confined to the sphere of things spiritual, and therefore excluded from the sphere of material things. "Prayer," it is said, "involves petition, but it is request for nothing outward." "It rests," it is alleged, with those *who oppose this hemispheric view*, "to prove that one single physical event may validly be excluded from the list of the predetermined, before they call on us to pray with reference to it." [1]

The difficulty which has pressed upon the propounders and advocates of this theory is evidently to them serious and solemn. And it would therefore ill become any one to speak or think of them with feelings of disparagement. But it is no personal disrespect to say that the theory rests on misapprehensions.

It is, in the *first* place, at variance with the express injunction of the Apostle, "in *every thing*, by prayer and supplication, with thanksgiving, let your requests be made known unto God" (Phil. iv. 6).

It is, in the *second* place, also at variance with one express petition in the model prayer which was taught by our Lord to his disciples, "Give us this day our daily bread."

It is, in the *third* place, based on a mistake con-

[1] "Contemporary Review," 1872, p. 189.

cerning the relation of the spiritual to the material. It is said, for instance, that "a spiritual antecedent will not produce a physical consequent." We are surprised at such a statement, for nothing seems clearer than that God's will was the spiritual antecedent which produced the whole physical universe. And, in the sphere of our own personal activity, nothing seems clearer than that a very large proportion of physical consequents are the direct results of spiritual antecedents. We will to speak, for example, or to walk. Our actual speaking or walking is the physical consequent.

Then there is in the basis of the theory this other oversight:—It is argued that all physical events belong to "the list of the predetermined," and therefore to that list of things which cannot be conceived of as alterable in consideration of prayer. But it is forgotten that the predetermination referred to, if a reality, must be either conditional or unconditional. If conditional, then prayer may be, in truth, the very condition that was, in multitudes of cases, precontemplated. But if unconditional, then the very same principle, in virtue of which it is maintained that there is no room and scope for prayer, must be further extended, and it must be contended that there is no place for *freedom* in reference to what men may utter physically with their mouths, or do physically with their hands.

But above and beyond these fallacies and unrealities, there is, in the *next* place, at the basis of the theory, an entire overlooking of the essential nature of prayer. Except in loose, though easily interpreted, popular and poetical representation,

prayer is not a force operating directly on the arm or hand of the Omnipotent. It is not even anything of the nature of an effort to prevail on the Almighty to exchange his own view of things for ours, or to substitute our plan of administering some of the affairs of his universe in place of his own. Prayer is the reverent and humble uplifting of the desire of the heart to a Being whom we recognize and adore, not only as infinitely powerful, but also as infinitely wise and infinitely good, and therefore infinitely removed from fickleness and caprice. We lift up our desire, not to confront and overcome any counter-desire in the heart of God, but to bow before his sovereignty in submission, adoration, and acquiescence. There is a *specific* desire that subtends every *particular* petition. It is this — that the infinitely wise and good One would do for us, and for those in whom we are interested, what *He* sees, all things considered, to be wisest and best. And beneath this *specific* desire there is subtended the one grand *generic* longing of the pious soul— "Not my will, but thine, be done."

If there be this grand *generic* longing of the pious soul, subtending, in the depths of the heart, all specific desires, and thus also all particular petitions, then it never can be, in the least degree, unseasonable or unreasonable to lift our actual desires up to God, whether they have reference to things spiritual or to things material. It may be that, in our ignorance, we sometimes ask what it would be,— so far as the outermost twigs of our particular petitions are concerned,—unwise and unbeneficent in God to grant. Some of our particular petitions

may, though we see it not, be unreasonable. But God understands what we mean at heart. He interlines our utterances, and reads the blundering petition accordingly. He looks down from the terminating twigs of our particular petitions to the great subtending branches, the solid stem, and the deep far-reaching roots of our desires. So, indeed, do we ourselves. And hence, as regards our particular petitions for blessings that are not expressly promised, we invariably lay them submissively before the footstool, and inwardly breathe, either explicitly or implicitly—"Nevertheless, not my will, but thine, be done."

This being the case, not only is it reasonable that we should lift up to God our desires in reference to all things physical that interest us, as well as in reference to things spiritual, but it would be most irreligious, unreasonable, unphilosophical, and injurious, *were we to allow ourselves to cherish any desires which we could not thus lift up to God in prayer.* Our cherished desires, whether we lift them up to God or not, form a large proportion of the vital constituents of our moral state. We cannot advance in life without them. We could not work without them. We *must* have desires, and cherish some of them. We must, so long as we continue self-consciously in the body, have desires in reference to physical things, —in reference to our bodily states for example, our bodily actions, and our material surroundings. And, if we are not utterly shut up in ourselves and to ourselves, we must in addition have desires in reference to the physical condition of others. If so, and if it is not wrong and unreasonable *that we should*

have and cherish such desires, how can it be wrong or unreasonable to uplift and utter them to God? Is it not the case, on the contrary, that the uplifting of our cherished desires into the realized presence of Infinite Purity, Infinite Goodness, and Infinite Wisdom, is the best of all imaginable ways of getting them increasingly transfigured into what is pure, and good, and wise? It should either be contended that we have no business to cherish desires in reference to things that are physical, or it should be frankly conceded that we should, ere we grant such desires a license to be the cherished inmates of our hearts, insist upon their being presented reverently before the throne of Him who is the living Ideal of perfection. It is in this way, doubtless, that we are to read the injunction, "Pray without ceasing."

In the light of these principles, all dark shadows of doubt and conscientious difficulty about praying for fine weather, or rain, or for the prosperity of honest and honourable business, or for the arrest of pestilence, take flight. It has been said, indeed, that "to pray for fine weather, or for rain—(except as a humble expression of man's dependence upon forces that are far vaster than he, and on Him from whom they emanate)—is quite as illegitimate as to pray against the approach of winter, the return of the seasons, or even against to-morrow's sunrise." [1] But not only does our Saviour say to his disciples, "Pray ye, in order that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath day;" we can see the reasonableness of his injunction. It was right in his disciples to *desire* that they should not require to flee

[1] "Contemporary Review," 1872, p. 187.

amid the severities of winter, or amid the solemnities of the Sabbath day. And if it is, for corresponding reasons, right that we should *desire* good weather, or rain, or prosperity in business, or protection from pestilence, or any other material blessing, it cannot be wrong to take our desire into the presence of our Father in heaven.

But will our prayer be efficacious? some one asks. Yes, we answer, to a certainty, if there be beneath the particular petition—as there always will be in the case of men reverent and righteous—the subtending specific desire, of which we have already spoken, the desire that God would do what, all things considered, He sees to be wisest and best; and if, too, beneath this specific desire, there be the still deeper subtending generic desire, to which our Lord Himself in his extremity gave utterance, "Nevertheless, not my will, but thine, be done." Our prayers *will* be efficacious if they be "the effectual fervent prayer" —the earnest energizing prayers—"of righteous men."

But yet, why is it, we would ask, that that question regarding *efficacy* is urged? All admit that the desire for good health, however interlined its utterance may require to be, is right and reasonable and beneficial. So is the desire for good weather, or for a good harvest, or for prosperity in business; though doubtless in each of these cases the utterance of the desire may require to be divinely interlined. And hence these desires are unquestioningly cherished; and no one troubles himself with the query, *But will they be efficacious?* We all know that they are right and reasonable, whether they may be effi-

cacious, in the sense intended, or not. We all know, too, when we begin to reflect, that in a certain high and most important sense they will be efficacious,—they will avail much. We all know that. And hence we *deliberately* cherish the desires.

It is right surely to apply the same principle to these very desires, *as lifted up to God*, and as thus transfigured into actual prayers. If it is right and reasonable that we should cherish the desires, it must be right and reasonable that we should lift them up as prayers to God. If it be wrong and unreasonable that we should lift them up to God as prayers, it must be wrong and unreasonable to cherish them as desires in our hearts. Their ascent to God can do no harm. On the contrary, it is sure to be beneficial and blissful, even although it should happen that the particular petitions presented are of such a nature that it would be neither wise nor merciful to answer them according to the minutiæ of their letter.

In the light of this same principle we can, with facility and deep inner satisfaction, account for those numerous and explicit promises of our Lord,—"What things soever ye desire, ye shall have them."—"All things whatsoever ye shall ask, ye shall receive."—"Ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you."—"If ye shall ask anything, I will do it."—"Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father, he will give it you."—"Ask, and ye shall receive. Seek, and ye shall find. Knock, and it shall be opened unto you. For every one that asketh, receiveth; and he that seeketh, findeth; and to him that knocketh, it shall be opened." These are certainly most

comprehensive promises. Are they always fulfilled? *Assuredly they are, when the prayers are the uplifting of the desires of the meek and lowly and righteous.* Jesus did not speak unadvisedly, or hold out expectations that could not possibly be realized.

Suppose, then, that two men, meek, lowly, righteous, agree to ask for rain, let us say, or for the recovery of some friend who is tossing to and fro under the grip of some dire disease, or for the patients in a hospital, or in all hospitals, or for the conversion of some sinner, or of all sinners,—will their prayer, in its real essence and import, be answered? Will their desire, in its real intensity, be granted? *Assuredly it will,* if the exceeding great and precious promises which are written in the volume of the book be indeed "yea and amen."

Why then, you ask, are any sinners unconverted? Why are any of the diseased unhealed? Why is there any distress at all? Why is there any anguish of nations, any inward commotions, or mutual antagonisms? Why are there any wars? Why any woes? Is it because the prayers of the righteous for the great masses of the world have been withheld? No; for Jesus prayed, and Paul prayed, and John prayed, and Elijah prayed. Is it then because their earnest energizing prayers have been unanswered? No; for the promises are "yea and amen." What then? The whole difficulty takes flight when we notice that in a meek and lowly and holy soul there cannot be unconditional or absolute desires for any of the objects specified. All desires for such objects are desires with a subtending condition expressed or understood. They are petitions subtended by other elements of

desire, which spread out wider and draw deeper. And these subtending desires are but partial aspects of one great element of desire, which absorbs within itself all details of desires. Minute details of desires are never absolute, and never detached. They are all and always but partial aspects of one great desire. That great desire is this,—*that God should do, in every given case or conjuncture, what it would be wisest and best, all things considered, and all interests consulted, for Him to do,*—what would be most in harmony with *our* moral constitution and with *his own* moral government. In its ultimate and sublimest form it is this—"*Thy will be done!*"

There is thus in every holy heart a vast ocean of desire that turns itself to God. On the surface of this ocean there are, it may be, waves of great generic desires. On the surface of these great waves there are, it may be, minor waves of specific desires; and on these minor waves there are still further, it may be, wavelets of desire for multitudes of minute things. Whatever, however, be the direction of these wavelets, they are never detached. They are never absolute. There is always, subtending them, a much larger wave, of which they really form only a part, and which rises up to God. This larger wave in its turn is but the partial upheaving of a still mightier wave of desire, which therefore comprehends within itself the smaller waves and wavelets. Then, underneath the whole is the great deep ocean of the soul's desire—absolutely undisturbed by all the little surface occurrences that produce wavelets and waves, and absolutely at rest,—conscious of no tides but what are simply responsive to the mightily attractive

power of the infinite will—the infinite good-will—of God. Hence, for instance, not even the most affectionate of holy fathers or mothers would wish God to overturn his infinitely wise method of administering the affairs of the universe in order to rescue their dearly beloved and lovely daughter from a watery grave. Neither would they, or could they, wish that He should break into shivers the moral constitution of the human heart and conscience, in order to convert their prodigal son from the error of his way. But, nevertheless, they earnestly desire their daughter's rescue and their son's conversion, and who shall say that the desire is either sinful, selfish, or absurd? If it be a right desire to cherish, *why, in the name of all that is right and reasonable, should it not be lifted up to Him, who is not only glorious in holiness, and fearful in praises, but truly unfettered in his hands, and ever doing wonders?* Why should the child be forbidden to ask from his Father, when it is certain that He will append to all his particular petitions the all-embracing one, the prayer that is inclusive and comprehensive of all prayers—"Not my will, but thine, be done!" J. MORISON.

PRINCIPLES, NOT RULES.

ST. LUKE xxii. 35, 36.

AT last I have found a passage of which I have long been in search, not for my own sake indeed, but for the sake of many whose spiritual condition and wants differ from my own. In common with most modern Commentators, I have frequently affirmed that the

Lord Jesus Christ came not to give men exact and binding rules of conduct, but large general principles, capable of the most flexible and various application. Rules of conduct *are* to be found among his sayings, indeed: as, for example, when He bade his disciples, if smitten on the one cheek, turn the other also; or when He bade them, if any man took their coat, let him also rob them of their cloak; or when He bade them give to every one that asked an alms of them, or go out on a journey unprovided with any change of clothing and with an empty purse. But these rules —so at least it has been contended—were not meant for a literal, and still less for an universal, obedience, since our Lord Himself did not obey them, nor his Apostles: nay, more, these rules were thrown into a paradoxical form, a form in which a literal and universal obedience was simply impossible, in order that we might see that they were not mere rules, and be compelled to search for the principles which underlie them.[1]

But there are many good men who distrust an appeal to "mere reason," although they admit reason to be among the choicest gifts of God. They assume it to be the enemy, rather than the friend, of faith, although they admit that to an irrational creature faith is simply impossible. And to such an argument as I have just sketched, they are apt to reply: "After all it is *only* an argument, only an appeal to reason, which we profoundly distrust. It carries no authority with it. Before we can weigh it and yield to it, you must produce some text, some Scripture,

[1] This argument is developed at some length in an article on "The Sermon on the Mount," which appeared in THE EXPOSITOR, vol. i. pp. 132-42.

which sanctions it, and gives it the stamp of a Divine authority."

Even they themselves, indeed, do not render a literal obedience to the rules laid down, as they imagine, in the New Testament. When smitten on the right cheek, so far from turning the left to the smiter, they prosecute him for assault and battery. If a man sues them at the law, and they are sentenced to lose a part of their estate, they do not present him with the rest of it, but carry an appeal to a higher court, and endeavour to get the sentence reversed. Having food and clothing, they are not therewith content, but try to get education and amusement also, and perhaps to amass a modest fortune. They do not give to every one that asketh of them, but refer the beggar to a Charity Organization Society, or even, if he be a sturdy and habitual beggar, hand him over to the police. So far from lending to every one that would borrow of them, they often "turn away" from them, buttoning up their pocket as they turn. When they engage in any Christian or philanthropic enterprize, they do not go out on it without purse or scrip or shoes: on the contrary, they take a full purse with them, if they can, and a scrip capable of holding more contributions than they are likely to obtain, and wear out their shoes in hunting up subscribers.

Nevertheless, they are not altogether at ease in their minds. Their conscience pricks them at times, as well it may. They doubt whether they would not be more truly Christian were they to render a more literal obedience to the commands of Christ. And, in a measure, I suppose we can all sympathize

with them. We, too, have our occasional misgivings as to whether the rules that fell from the lips of Christ do not condemn many of our modern methods of action, whether we should not be better and happier, though poorer, men were we to do even as He said.

Now we have sins enough to answer for without adding on imaginary sins. Our hearts are sore burdened at the best; we need not impose burdens on them which God does not mean them to bear. And therefore it is that I have long been looking for some clear authoritative deliverance from the lips of Christ Himself that might relieve those who hold themselves bound to a literal obedience which yet they find it impossible to render, by shewing *that our Lord Himself did not intend his own rules for a literal and universal obedience;* but did intend that we should look through them to those great *principles* of justice, compassion, trust in God, and brotherly kindness, of which they were passing illustrations. And here, at last, is that clear authoritative deliverance.

For observe what it is that our Lord is here doing. He is not simply, as in the Sermon on the Mount, repealing rules and laws given by them of old time. He is not simply both supplanting and fulfilling them by the inward and spiritual principles to which they gave an imperfect and temporary form. He is *repealing a rule which He Himself had given* to his disciples only a few months ago, although, as they confess, that rule had worked very well. He is *replacing* it by a new rule, a rule the very opposite of that which He had previously given them; a rule which no sane and reflective man can possibly sup-

pose He intended them to obey *as a rule*, since it is alien to the very spirit, to the whole drift, of his teaching.

Here, then, we have a clear and convincing proof that the rules given by Christ were not intended to become ordinances of perpetual observance; that He did not mean men to render them a literal, and still less a perpetual and universal, obedience; that we must interpret them, as all other of his utterances, by aid of our own common sense and spiritual insight; that what we are to obey in them is the sacred and eternal principles which they illustrate.

And this conviction grows on us the more we study these remarkable verses. In the first of them (*Verse* 35) our Lord reverts to the first missionary journey of the Twelve. When the second year of his ministry was drawing to a close, He sent them forth to teach and to preach in all the cities of Israel. They were, He told them,[1] to take no money in their purses, not even the copper coins familiar to the poor; to carry no scrip, or travelling-bag, containing provisions and other conveniences for the journey, and no change of clothes or sandals; but to set off as they were, with nothing but a staff in their hands, casting themselves wholly on the kindness of men and the providence of God. This was to be their rule for the time, and I am not concerned to deny that, for the time, they felt bound to render it a literal obedience. It may be that Christ thought it well to startle a selfish and indifferent world into attention, by presenting it with a spectacle such as it had never seen, or imagined, before. It may be that

[1] Matt. x. 9, 10.

the Twelve drew all men's eyes upon them, and shewed that a new spirit of love and meekness and unselfish devotion had come into the world, by walking among them penniless yet content, and by submitting to any wrong or insult they chose to inflict. Such a spectacle could not fail to impress the world; it may have disposed many to believe that they who could do such things as these must have a message of love and peace and good will for their neighbours.

But even if the Twelve, for a time, rendered a literal obedience to these rules, it does not follow that the rules were designed for a constant and universal observance. Their trust in God, their meekness, their devotion to noble ends—these indeed are for all time; but not the modes in which they exhibited them. And it would be, as Stier calls it, "a mere fanaticism of the letter" of Scripture, were we to bind these rules on the consciences of modern missionaries and ministers of the gospel. Take the spirit of Christ's injunction, say that no minister should waste his time and energies, and that no Church should compel or permit him to waste them, in securing a provision for the external wants and comforts of life; say that every minister and missionary should be so devoted to the service of God and man as to be bent on serving them at all costs and all risks; and you may very safely argue that the words of Christ are still binding. But read them as a rule, say that no minister or missionary is to have a purse, or a change of clothes, or more than one pair of boots, and you simply expose the words of Christ to ridicule and contempt. Nor only so. You also insist on retaining a rule which He Himself has repealed,

and on pushing aside the rule, which yet is equally binding, with which He replaced it. For at the close of his ministry, in view of the dark and troublous days that were coming on them, He gave the Twelve a new rule: "*But now, he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise his scrip; and he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one.*" Formerly, they were to go forth penniless, unprovided with aught but a staff, and to bear with meekness whatever wrongs or insults the world might inflict on them. Now, they are to put money in their purse, to pack their scrip with provisions and conveniences, to exchange their staff for a sword—not to submit to, but to defy and conquer, the hostility of the world.

Now, obviously, it is quite impossible that we should render a literal obedience to *both* these rules. Even a minister, or a missionary, cannot both take, and not take, a purse with him, cannot both submit to wrong and insult and resent them with the sword. And it is hardly less obvious that even the Twelve never attempted to obey the latter rule literally. When do we meet *them* with a full purse, or even trying to fill it? When do we see them anxiously accumulating a store of provisions and comforts, carrying a scrip that should render them independent of the bounty whether of man or of God? And how could the servants of Him whose kingdom is not of this world fight with the sword? No sensible man can well suppose that Christ meant the apostles to leave the table at which they had just eaten their Last Supper with Him, and go out into the market to buy swords; or, having bought them, to wield

them in his service: for only a few hours after these words were uttered St. Peter did strike at Malchus with a sword, and only received a rebuke for his pains. The first of these rules may have received a literal obedience for a time; but at what time could the second of them have been obeyed after the letter with the consent and approbation of Christ? And if this new rule was not intended for a literal obedience even by the Twelve, it is very certain that it cannot be meant for an universal and perpetual obedience. Our Lord could not have meant that we should all fill our purses, and arm ourselves with weapons of war, in order to prepare ourselves for his service. And yet this new rule is just as binding as the old one. It would be just as reasonable to argue that we are to accumulate and to fight for Christ, as it is to argue that we are to dispense with purse and scrip and shoes, and turn the other cheek to the smiter, and to give to every one that asketh of us.

The simple fact is—as by this time surely even the veriest stickler for a literal interpretation of Scripture must see—that even when He threw his teaching into the form of rules, Christ did not intend us to take them as rules, but as picturesque and paradoxical illustrations of principles. Her eis the proof. *Christ Himself repeals a rule which He Himself had given, and replaces it with a rule the very opposite of that which He had given;* nay, replaces it with a rule which never was, and never will be, literally obeyed. And thus He drives us to look for the principles which underlie his words. He teaches us that as there are times when we are to

win upon the world by unselfishness and an unresisting uncomplaining submission to wrong, in short, by *not* resisting evil, so also there are times in which we *are* to resist, to strive against it manfully, to arm and nerve ourselves for the defence and furtherance of the Faith. If at times we are to be *meek* for the truth, at other times we are to be *valiant* for the truth.

Much, therefore, as we love to get definite rules by which we may guide ourselves mechanically and without thought, Christ refuses to give us such rules; nay, perplexes us and compels us to thought by seeming to give us rules on which we cannot act, or rules one of which contradicts the other. And is it not well that He should refuse us? Rules breed customs, and customs breed corruption. One of our own poets warns us that our modes of action must be continually adapted and re-adapted to the changing conditions of the time, lest even "one *good* custom should corrupt the world," losing all its life and force by constant and mechanical repetition. Whereas, if we have principles instead of rules, we are obliged to use our common sense in applying and in varying our application of them; we are compelled to observe and reflect, to let our thoughts play freely around them, to learn and grow wiser by experience. And all these—observation, reflection, the use of good sense and experience—are educational influences of the highest value. It is by these we live, and keep our principles alive, and help to give life to the world around us.

CARPUS.

THE ATONEMENT AND PRAYER.

THE object of the following paper is to shew that the principle underlying Prayer is identical with the principle embodied in the Atonement, and that accordingly to reject the latter is implicitly to reject the former. Logically considered, both stand and fall together: I say, *logically* considered. At the present time, however, many who have been driven to reject the Atonement still cling with all their might to the reality of Prayer. Whilst the Atonement is a stumbling-block and an offence, Prayer is a strong tower and a refuge. Happy inconsistency! I should be troubled if these pages were to contribute toward rendering this happy inconsistency impossible; I should be greatly rejoiced if they helped to convert the inconsistency into a deep and abiding consistency.

For the sake of clearness, and in order to prevent the suspicion that the argument may be based on ambiguities or consist of tricks of subtlety, I will begin by defining as plainly as I can, in general terms, the senses in which I shall speak of Prayer and of the Atonement.

First, then, *Prayer*. There are two main views of the nature or bearings of Prayer. (*a*) According to the Church or orthodox view, Prayer, to use very general terms, is a mode of human activity by which

God is determined or influenced, as He would not be determined or influenced without it. In more concrete phrase, when we pray we ask God to be towards us, or do for us, what, without our prayer, He would not be or do. As the schools have it, Prayer here is assumed to have an objective effect. (*b*) According to the other view of Prayer—if view of *prayer* it deserve to be designated—words in the form of petition or request are addressed to God, not with the expectation or intent of influencing Him, but partly for the purpose of expressing submission to his will, and partly for the purpose of affecting our own inward state. To this class of thinkers — and it is a class which has long been numerous in Germany, and which is rapidly growing in our own country—Prayer is essentially *une gymnastique spirituelle*, as it has been aptly described. Its philosophy is that the petitioner unconsciously influences himself, and either fits himself for doing without what he thinks he needs and desires, or for assimilating that which comes to him in the regular course of nature, but which, apart from this preparation, might possibly escape him. In the language of the schools, Prayer is here a purely subjective process.

Of the orthodox view there are again two modifications. (*c*) Some hold it to be right and of use to pray to God in relation to external things, such as recovery from sickness, seasonable weather, provision of food and clothing, protection from dangers by land and water, and other similar blessings. (*d*) Others again — and their numbers are rapidly increasing—would restrict prayer to what are termed

spiritual blessings, such as light for the understanding, invigoration for the will, stimulus for the emotions, and comfort and support in suffering and sorrow.

For the sake of not burdening my argument with unnecessary difficulties, I shall speak of Prayer solely in this second sense. I might almost say that I make this restriction, not because prayer for spiritual things is less encompassed with difficulties than prayer for external things, but because to my mind it is either equally or even more perplexing. At any rate, as this aspect of Prayer is still accepted by many, it will serve my present purpose to leave the other aspect out of consideration.

Let us now turn to *the Atonement.* There are two main views of the saving work of Jesus Christ.

(*a*) According to the Church or orthodox view, to use very general terms, the humiliation, sufferings, and death of Christ were undertaken for the purpose of producing a change in the relation of God to man as well as of man to God. However varied may be the modes of representing the effect produced on God, and of explaining how it was produced, all agree in the one point that something was done apart from which no reconciliation between Him and man could have been brought about. This is the essential element. In the phraseology of the schools, this is the objective view of the Atonement.

(*b*) According to the other view, the humiliation, sufferings, and death of Christ were undertaken for the purpose of simply producing a change in the relation of man to God. He came to scatter the darkness and correct the errors of the human mind

touching God; his mission was so to exhibit the Divine Character—its holiness, truth, and love—and the evil of sin, that men should be constrained to return in humble penitence and loving trust to their Father in heaven. The Scripture expression of this view is, "God was in Christ, reconciling the world to Himself." This is the essential element. As worded by the schools, it is the subjective view of the Atonement.

It is in the first mentioned sense that I shall speak of Christ's work, especially of its Godward aspect.

Now what I affirm and wish to shew is that whosoever allows the utility of Prayer, in the modified sense referred to above, has no logical right to object to the orthodox view of the Atonement. One and the same principle underlies both.

Having thus defined our terms, let us proceed to inquire into the significance of Prayer and to ascertain the principle involved in it.

We will restrict our inquiry to prayer for Divine aid in the discharge of our primary or direct duty to God and man; that is, the duty of cherishing certain emotions and avoiding others. All duty may be said, in common phrase, to begin in the region of the heart.

If we have a God and Father in heaven, and if we owe Him anything at all, we surely owe Him reverence, trust, and love; or, to comprehend the whole in one word, we ought to love Him with all our heart and soul and mind and strength. This, as Christ taught, is the first and great commandment. In truth, this is all we have it in our power to give to Him whose are the heavens and the earth and the

fulness thereof. Now when we become conscious of falling short of the reverence, trust, and love we owe to God, what course do we take? What is our remedy? Where is our hope? We cannot help ourselves, for it is "we" who need the help; our fellow-men cannot help us, for they are in like case with ourselves. To whom then are we to look? Christian teachers and believers send us to God in prayer. From our indifference and distrust and coldness we ask God to free us. We pray, "Inspire us with reverence, with holy awe; enable us to trust, give us faith; fill our hearts with Divine love." We entreat God by his Holy Spirit to work in us to will and to do his own good pleasure relating to Himself.

I have quoted expressions which are in common use by Christians of all sections of the Church universal—some of them have been used by those who never heard either of Christ or his Church. What do they signify? Remember it is *our* duty to cherish such emotions toward God. This is the law binding on *us*. God being what He is, and we being what we are, this is how we should behave—we namely, we ourselves. And we ask God to help us to fulfil this law; we ask Him to do for us what we cannot do. He is to enter into us, and to honour, trust, and love Himself on our behalf, in, with, and through us. God in man is to obey God out of man, and the obedience thus rendered by God to Himself is our obedience. God's relation in us to Himself is counted as, nay, verily is, so far as our consciousness is concerned, our relation to Him. This position should be distinctly apprehended. When we ask God to enable us, to energize in us, that we may honour,

trust, and love Him, we are really asking Him to honour, trust, and love Himself in us, and to make this his loving and honouring of Himself ours—ours in the truest and most real sense, ours as absolutely as though it were in the ordinary sense ours. It is his, and yet ours; it is ours, and yet his.

And now let us turn to man. I suppose I may take for granted that we owe to our fellow-men respect, trust, love, in the various degrees and modifications conditioned by relations and circumstances. I refer here, again, solely to the emotions, not to their manifestations in act: to the inward relation, not to its outward and visible embodiment. This is the law binding on all of us. No man can be what his nature requires him to be unless he renders to his fellow-men and receives from them such respect, trust, and love.

As a matter of fact, however, we find that we fall wofully short of our duty, and therefore of our ideal. Pride, with its correlate contempt, distrust, suspicion, envy, hatred, and uncharitableness, take possession of our hearts. Nor do our own efforts, even when we put them forth, suffice for the cleansing of our hearts. Even if we vanquish an enemy for a moment, it returns; and while we are battling with one form of these inward evils, another instals itself in the high places of our soul. What then are we counselled to do? To pray; to pray to God,—"Cleanse thou the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of thy Holy Spirit." We ask God again to work in us to will and to do his good pleasure, but now relatively to our fellow-men—to enable us to think and feel toward them as we ought. But what

again is this? Surely it is to ask Him to fulfil his own law in us; to honour, trust, and love our fellow-men for, in, with, and through us, and to make his conduct our conduct. If it do not mean this, I am unable to say what it does mean. In thus interpreting our ordinary expressions I use no violence; I do but bring out an aspect of them which is too frequently overlooked.

The principle involved in prayer for spiritual blessings has been already indicated, but it may be generally expressed as follows: *God obeys his own law in our stead;* or, somewhat differently and still more generally expressed, *God fulfils his own law on our behalf, and his fulfilment stands as ours, or rather really becomes our fulfilment.*

How God can do this, or how we can have it done, is a mystery. That it takes place is a matter of personal experience. My purpose is not now to explain the position just described; but, whether understood or not, it is a fact that God does work in us to will and to do; that He thinks and feels and wills in us and for us; and that his thinking, feeling and willing are in the truest sense our own. Nay more, it might almost be said that what is thus wrought in us by God is more truly our own than what we work by and for ourselves.

In a very real sense, indeed, what has been affirmed regarding Divine help is in its measure true of the help rendered by man to man. He who aids me in the solution of a problem, in the unravelling of a perplexity, in the clearing up of a difficulty; he who by his exhortations, or warnings, or example, or stimulus, strengthens me to vanquish evil or to

discharge duty, may be said to have done my work for me. He has wrought what it was my business to have wrought, and his effort, and the results thereof, become mine whilst yet they are his. God's work for us, however, is as much more real, more intimate, and more truly our own, than that of man, as his relation to us is more profound, more inward, more vital. "In him we live, and move, and have our being."

Let us now turn to the consideration of the Atonement. I have already defined in general terms the view of the Atonement to which I here refer.

Both in the New Testament and in the writings of the teachers of the Church various modes of setting forth the two aspects of the work of Christ have been adopted.

In the former we find descriptions such as, God "hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him;" "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us;" "Now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself;" "Being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him;" "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness, that he might be just, and the justifier of him who believeth in Jesus;" "In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins;" "The Son of man came . . . to give his life a ransom for many;" "By his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us;" "Who his own

self bare our sins in his own body on the tree." In various modifications and combinations the same descriptions have been employed by the teachers and preachers of Christianity.

At the bottom of all these representations lies the idea that Christ took our place and bore what it was just and right that we should bear. His humiliation, sufferings, and bitter death were endured for our sake, in our stead—not merely to shew us his own feelings, or the mind of God, or the nature of sin, or all these, though this was part of his design; but because, unless He had endured them, corruption, misery, and eternal death must have been our portion. In a word, He was our substitute. Christ being, in the belief of the Church, the Son of God, the third Person of the Blessed Trinity, what He did for us was done by God.

Now surely we have here the very principle which we found underlying Prayer—God taking our place, enduring our sufferings, and his endurance standing as ours. In the case of Divine help given in answer to prayer, God obeys his own law for us, and his obedience becomes ours: in the case of the Atonement, God endures the penalty of the transgression of his own law for us, and his endurance becomes ours.

But there is a difference—the difference between active obedience and passive endurance—and perhaps this difference may be an essential difference. Let us see.

I have already observed that, God being what He is, and we being what we are, we ought to cherish certain emotions toward Him. This is the law bind-

ing on us in virtue of his nature and of our relation to Him. The reverse side of this position is: The natural relations between God and man being such as they are, if man neglect to cherish certain emotions toward God, such-and-such sufferings must come upon him. From these sufferings no escape is provided either by man's individual constitution, or by the system of which he forms a part—so far as we know. Now, in the last instance, the suffering in question is no less required by God than the obedience. His will is as really and truly expressed in it as in his positive commands. The sufferings are as natural as the claims. In a very true sense man is normally related to God when he endures suffering after or in sinning: if he could sin with impunity his abnormality would be double. Suffering is the normal effect produced by the Divine law on him who is guilty of abnormal conduct. But unfortunately this suffering means to man, misery, ruin. It is *he* who sins and suffers, who suffers in sinning.

So, then, suffering is God's law for man's passivity; obedience, for man's activity. The one as really as the other, therefore, is obedience to the Divine law. Hence, too, Christ is said to have rendered "*obedience unto death, even the death of the cross.*"

When, therefore, Christ takes our place in the Atonement, He does—that is, God does—in principle the same thing that is done when, in answer to prayer, He helps us to render unto Him due obedience. In both cases the righteousness of God becomes our righteousness: it is his, yet ours; it is ours, yet his. For the expression of the principle in this application we may again use the general

terms :—*God fulfils his own law on our behalf; and his fulfilment stands as ours, or rather really becomes our fulfilment.*

So far from the endurance of our penalty involving greater difficulty than the performance of our duties, it might be considered to involve less difficulty. It seems easier to conceive of a substitute bearing our burden than doing our work. In the latter case a more complete incorporation with the will of him who is aided seems to be requisite than in the former. That relatively to which I am and must be passive seems more readily transferable than that relatively to which I am and must be active. Be this, however, as it may, the principle in both cases appears to me one and the same.

I am aware of the objections that are raised against the substitutionary view of Christ's work. We are told that it is an unreality. We are told that it is a monstrous perversion of truth and rectitude that the innocent should be treated as guilty ; and the guilty, on that ground, as innocent. We are told that it is impossible for a penalty to be transferred ; that, though we commonly enough suffer with and for each other, such suffering is in no strict sense substitutionary ; that each back must bear its own burden ; that God Himself, the loving Father, cannot require a substitution such as is involved in the orthodox view of the Atonement : and much more of a like character. All I can reply at present is :—If God can be righteous on our behalf in the form of obedience, why not in the form of suffering ? If it be untrue and perverse for Him to endure our penalty and *count* it as ours, nay, *make* it our endurance, why is it not untrue and

perverse for Him to render obedience to Himself on our behalf, and make his obedience ours?

But the identity of the principle of Prayer and the Atonement will become still more clear when I call attention to another equally common subject of prayer, not included in those already considered. We do not restrict our petitions for inward blessings to light, invigoration, and stimulus: we also ask for support and comfort in suffering and sorrow. Now what do we mean by "Divine support and comfort"? Surely, that God in some way should, as it were, take our suffering and sorrow on Himself. I do not now refer to prayer for the removal, for the taking away, of suffering and sorrow—that is a totally different thing—but for help in bearing them. We beg not only for Divine sympathy—though that is much, and true sympathy, even in man, aims at far more than mere fellow-feeling, even at veritable participation in, and, were it possible, transference of, the suffering and sorrow—we beg also for real help, assistance. Men are able to assist us really in bearing a load that presses on our shoulders or hands; when we become weary, they can put themselves more or less in our place: but they cannot touch the inward burdens. This is God's privilege; and as really as a brother man can relieve us in carrying a physical burden, so really can God relieve us in carrying a spiritual burden. But not even God can do this, without in his measure feeling our suffering to be suffering to Him, our sorrow, sorrow to Him. In these relations, too, He must be "*touched* with the *feeling* of our infirmities." *There is no such thing in the moral world as bearing a burden without feeling it to be a burden.*

Remembering now that inward suffering and sorrow are, at all events for the most part, the fruit of sin, either directly or indirectly—the fruit of the sin either of the individual sufferer or of the race to which he belongs—is it not clear that, when God in his condescension answers our prayers for support and comfort, He undertakes to bear for us the results of the violation of his own law. Inasmuch, further, as these results are of his own ordering, nay, in the last instance of his own inflicting, are we not compelled to say that, in helping us to bear our sufferings, He is indirectly in its measure inflicting suffering on Himself for our sake, offering a sacrifice to Himself in our stead, and making propitiation to Himself for our sins?

If what has just been advanced hold good, then the so-called "moral" view of the Atonement is open to essentially the same objections as the orthodox view, whatever its protestations to the contrary. Even its advocates will not dream of questioning that the humiliation, suffering, sadness, and death which were endured by Christ in carrying out his mission of enlightenment and love—which were in fact not merely an accidental accompaniment but a necessary feature of that mission—were endured, not on his own account, but on ours; not for his own sake, but for ours. Nor will they question that the sufferings from which He delivers us would have been justly ours—that in our case they would have been a penalty for sin. And, further, they will not deny that the humiliation, sufferings, and death He endured were veritably painful and distressing to Him. But if all this be true, how can they avoid saying of

Christ—He became our substitute, He endured our penalty, and his endurance is constituted our endurance ?

One other point only will I allude to before closing this imperfect discussion. As the Divine Help is given us in answer to prayer, so we participate in Christ's atoning work through faith. How consistent this is, we shall clearly see when we have fully learnt that whilst *faith is the soul of prayer, prayer is the body of faith.* D. W. SIMON.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE HAGADA.

FROM my last paper the general reader will, I hope, have gained some insight into the character of that vast homiletic literature which may be generally described under the name of the HAGADA, which, as I have already said, occupies a large part of the Gemara, whereas the Mishna is almost exclusively Halachic. I only purpose in the present sketch to give some specimens of typical Hagadôth under different heads, and in this way to illustrate their origin and their general place in Talmudic literature. The Talmud has often been indiscriminately condemned on the faith of extracts which adduced absurd and exaggerated stories, not only from the Gemara itself, but even from Midrashic writings which are no older than the thirteenth or fourteenth centuries, but which are all loosely classed together as being in the Talmud. Now I can hardly express too strongly my own low appreciation of Talmudic literature, as far as regards its mere literary qualities; but it is fair to say that many of these wild stories have been

judged from a wrong point of view, and I shall have rendered some small service to those unacquainted with the subject if I put them on their guard against a mistaken impression, and enable them to form of these narratives a juster estimate.

1. We cannot, for instance, approach the Talmud without finding that it contains a multitude of legends which are marked by the grossest and wildest extravagance. Their existence is perfectly recognized by the Rabbis themselves, and a recent writer[1] has ranged all Hagadôth under the three heads of the Scientific, the Allegoric, and the Hyperbolic.[2] Now some of these latter are hyperbole pure and simple, an hyperbole partly due to the dreamy intensity of Oriental imagination, which admits even into Scripture such expressions as "cities walled to heaven;" and partly to a deliberate desire to enforce attention. Similar exaggerations, adopted for the same purpose, may be found freely in the works of mediæval preachers. Thus, when we are told of the city Bethyr, that four hundred thousand Jews perished in its destruction; that their bodies rendered the soil prolific for seven years; that it was so vast that in one quarter of it the people were dancing and singing without any suspicion that in another quarter the citizens were being massacred by the enemy; that it had four hundred synagogues, and each synagogue four hundred schools, and each school four hundred scholars; that the horses were up to the bits in blood, which swept away rocks weighing forty pounds, and coloured the sea red for four miles, though

[1] Hamburger Realwört. s. v. I.

[2] These latter are called דברי חבאי והפרזה.

Bethyr was forty miles distant from the sea;[1]—it would be an utter mistake to treat such fancies as though they were seriously intended. They were merely the invention of exiles striving to alleviate the long nights of misery and captivity with the tales and legends of that past glory on which in their degradation they were incessantly brooding. They simply arose from the same revelry of fancy in speaking about its favourite subjects of contemplation as that which led to the many amazing myths which have clustered round the careers of Abraham and Moses. Thus we are told that Abraham was a giant of giants; that he reached to the height of seventy-four ordinary men; that he built for his seventeen sons by Keturah an iron city, of which the walls were so high that the sun could never penetrate within them; and that, in order to remedy this inconvenience, he gave them a basin of precious stones so lustrous that they superseded all necessity for daylight. These must simply be regarded as the nursery tales of a patriotism which found in them some consolation for the reality of its hopelessness.[2]

This class of Hagadôth is the most worthless of all.[3] They may often owe their origin to the strange

[1] Midrash on Echa. ii. 2; Jer. Taanith. 68 d.; Derenbourg, "Palestine," p. 434; Graetz. iv. 462. [2] Sopherim, ch. 21.

[3] Some writers have dwelt on the low and impure passages which sometimes pollute the pages of the Talmud. That many sections might be adduced which, to our taste, are inexpressibly coarse, is perfectly true; but I venture to say that, as the Jews are perhaps historically one of the most chaste of nations, so the Talmud is not, so far as I am aware, *wilfully* and corruptively prurient. Its amazing minutiæ are indeed revolting to a modern reader, but they were almost necessitated by the very objects in furtherance of which the entire literature came into existence; and after all they are—to the extent of my small knowledge—neither so dangerous nor so repulsive as the Roman Catholic —and, alas! I fear we must now add as those Anglican—manuals of the confessional, which are defended on much the same grounds as the microscopic inquiries and regulations of the Rabbis.

stories of Arabic invention in which the poets and fabulists of nomad tribes delighted; and their preservation is perhaps due partly to the mere delight in the marvellous, especially when it bore on the history and glories of their own nation, and partly to the reverence with which the Jews treasured up the most playful, the most incidental, the most trivial legend, allusion, enigma, allegory, or illustration, which had ever found a place in the daily lectures of their more esteemed Rabbis.

2. Sometimes even these hyperboles have originated in a desire to throw light on some obscurity. We are told, for instance, that Og, king of Bashan, was the only person who escaped the deluge, and that he did so by wading by the side of Noah's ark. What possible reason could there be for the invention of such a fable? We find it at once in the desire to account for the fact that the Jews accepted Genesis x. as a complete genealogical ethnography, and felt called upon to account for the appearance in the sacred narrative of Rephaim and other pre-Canaanite nations, who find no place in that ancient and remarkable document. The gigantic stature of Og furnished their ingenuity with a suggestion of his possible escape from the Flood, and thus provided an ancestor for the races of whose existence they could otherwise give no explanation from their received system of anthropology.

3. Another story about Og introduces us to another very extensive class of Hagadôth—those, namely, which sprang from the slavish literalism of an absurd and superstitious exegesis.

The story occurs in the Babylonian Gemara of the

Berachôth,[1] and is as follows. After an allusion to the stones which God cast from heaven on the kings of Canaan at the battle of Bethhoron, it continues :—

"As regards the stone which Og the king of Bashan wished to fling on Israel, see what is related. 'How wide,' said Og, 'was the extent of the camp of Israel?' 'Three parasangs.' 'I will then go and tear up a rock of this size, and fling it over their camp, to slay them.' He went to tear up the rock, and carried it away on his head. But God supervened, and put some grasshoppers (?)[2] on it, who pierced an opening in the rock, so that it fell down on the neck of Og. When he wished to take it off, his teeth prolonged themselves on both sides to enormous tusks, and he could not lift it away: and that is why it is said (Psa. iii. 8), *Thou hast broken the teeth of the ungodly.* This is in accordance with the opinion of Resh Lakish, who thus explains this verse : 'You should not read, Thou hast broken, but, Thou hast made to grow' (*i.e.*, by prolonging them)."

Now, in the first instance, this wild story was simply the illustration which suggested itself to some Rabbis of the strong expression of the Psalmist to which he alludes. Resh Lakish merely adopted the common formula of the Talmud, "Read not so-and-so, but so-and-so;" and by substituting for *broken* the similar-sounding word *increased* (*i.e.*, by reading שברת for שברבת), improved the story by an alliteration, or what we should almost call a pun. And then the story continues :[3]—"What was the height of Moses ?

[1] Ch. ix. Schwab. p. 450.

[2] The word is also rendered "ants." See Kitseer, *Inhalt der Talmud*, p. 119.

[3] Chiarini, *Théorie du Judaisme*, i. 266.

Ten cubits (in building the Tabernacle he had attained to the same size). He took an axe ten cubits long, leapt up an equal height, wounded Og on the ankle (!)—who tottered with the blow—and so killed him." So that Og's ankle alone was thirty cubits high!

And yet some of the Rabbis were jealous of any ridicule even with reference to their most immense hyperboles. Thus in the Babha Bathra (75. 1) a story is told that on one occasion R. Jochanan was discoursing to his disciples about precious stones thirty ells square with which God should rebuild Jerusalem. "How so," asked a disciple, "when they are scarcely ever found even so large as an egg?" A few days after, however, this disciple saw precious stones as large as those described in the hands of the angels, and apologized to his master. "Wretch," he exclaimed, "you would not then have believed if you had not seen." And he darted at him a glance so severe, that he fell dead upon the spot!

4. The incident of the grasshoppers, or, as Rashi translates the expression, "ants," may remind the reader of another story, far better known, but resembling this of Og in two respects—namely, because it is the product of national detestation, and because it introduces God's meanest creatures as adequate to wreak retribution on the enemies of the chosen race. It is the story of the fate of Titus, found in Bereshith Rabba (x.), Vayikra Rabba (xxii.), Gittin (56 b), and elsewhere. It is that, after the destruction of Jerusalem, the Emperor Titus was threatened with the vengeance of God, and on his

voyage from Palestine was met by an overwhelming storm, in which he nearly perished. When, however, he had safely arrived on shore, dreading only the fearfulness of the greater phenomena of nature, he declared that now at any rate he was safe, and might defy the God of the Jews. Whereon God sent a little gnat which crept up his nostrils into his head, and there feasted upon his brain. This caused the emperor excruciating tortures, which nothing was able to alleviate, till on one occasion, as he passed a blacksmith's forge, he found that the clang of the hammer seemed to frighten the insect and keep it quiet. Accordingly he hired the blacksmith to bang and hammer at his anvil all day and night long, and so gained a brief pause from his agonies. But at the end of eight days the creature had become perfectly accustomed to the sound, and resumed his meal, until the miserable wretch died, detested of God, in excruciating pangs. On his brain being opened the gnat (יתוש) was found there as big as a sparrow, very heavy, and with proboscis and claws of iron and steel.

In this weird and horrible story who does not see a mere play of fancy, striving to illustrate the law of retribution by which God visits the offences of powerful malefactors in unsuspected ways and by trivial instruments, while at the same time the virulent intensity of Jewish execration consoles its miseries by devising unheard-of vengeance on its oppressor? To the world Titus was *deliciæ humani generis*—the "darling of the human race;" but to the crushed and excited Jew, who had been forced

To swell, slow pacing by the car's tall side,
The Stoic tyrant's philosophic pride ;
To flesh the lion's ravenous jaws, or feel
The sportive fury of the fencer's steel ;
Or pant, deep-plunged beneath the sulph'rous mine,
For the soft airs of balmy Palestine,

he was known only as Titus Harashang—"Titus the wicked tyrant." [1]

5. But to return to the multitudes of Hagadôth which arose from verbal *jeux d'esprit*, or the literal exegesis of expressions, either obviously metaphorical or capable of two interpretations. We find another remarkable instance of them in the legend of Abraham. That Terah, before the call of Abraham, had been an idolater, is a Hagadah preserved even in the Bible ;[2] and the Jews said that he had been a maker of idols in the reign of Nimrod. When Abraham had been concealed from the murderous designs of Nimrod—under circumstances resembling those of the concealment of Moses from the decree of Pharaoh—he grew up secretly in a mountain cave ; and having tried to find a God in the sun, the moon, and other natural objects,[3] was at last taught the worship of the true God in the house of Noah, and, like Gideon, destroyed in the night the idols in his father's house. He was detected, brought before "the mighty hunter," and cast into a burning fiery furnace, in which the king saw him walking unharmed, and called him forth, to hear him proclaim the God by whom he had been saved.

Now this long Hagadah, which I have greatly abbreviated, is simply, from beginning to end, a

[1] טימום הושע. [2] Josh. xxiv. 2.
[3] See, too, Koran, vi. 74; Stanley's "Jewish Church," i. 17.

story made up—as Hagadôth constantly are—from fragments of various Scripture narratives. It is merely a legend attached to the name of Abraham, but woven together out of the Biblical careers of Moses, Gideon, and the Three Children.[1] But how did it all arise? Probably from the single word Ur, which means "fire," together with fanciful commentaries on Isaiah xxix. 22, "Thus saith the Lord who redeemed Abraham;"—on Genesis xv. 7, "I am the Lord thy God who saved thee out of Ur of the Chaldees (Urkasdîm, 'Fire of the Chaldees')," which was believed to apply necessarily to deliverance from some great danger, because of its resemblance to Exodus xx. 1, "I am the Lord thy God who delivered thee out of the land of Egypt;"—and on the identification of Nimrod with Amraphel, king of Shinar. This identification is founded on the anagram of the name Amraphel, in the ordinary Cabbalistic manner, into Amar Phoul (אמר פול). "He said—Throw!" *i.e.*, throw Abraham into the fire![2]

6. The Gemara literally abounds in instances more or less resembling this. It will therefore be seen at once that among the later Jews, as indeed among all nations, both ancient and modern, mythology is often a mere disease of language. To illustrate this fact from Greek and Roman mythology would lead us too far, but there is a modern myth so closely resembling this one of Amraphel, that I

[1] This is, however, a late legend. It seems to have been barely known to Nachmanides (on Gen. xi. 28), and is not found in the older Midrashîm. It is found, however, in the Midrash Rabba on Genesis, sec. 39; Maase Abraham, &c.; Hamburger, s. v. Abraham.

[2] Midrash Rabba, Genesis, sec. 39; Exodus, sec. 23, &c.; Hamburger, *ubi supra.*

may here adduce it. Every one is aware that the heraldic insignia of modern Antwerp are a hand and a castle, and that the legend of the city tells how a giant Antigonus built himself a castle at the mouth of the Scheldt, and lived by exacting toll from all ships that entered the river. If they refused to pay toll, he cut off the hands of their crews. This myth is simply an illiterate attempt of popular etymology to account for the name of the city, which they derived from *hand* and *werfen*, "to throw a hand," whereas in reality it is derived from words which mean "the people's wharf." [1]

7. I will adduce four more instances, as brief as I can find, of the origination of Hagadistic allusions from mere words.

(1) In the Abhoth de Rabbi Nathan [2] we are told that not only was Abraham pious, but that his spirit of devotion was even shared by his camels. This appears from the address of Rebekah to Eliezer, "Come in thou blessed of the Lord; wherefore standest thou without? for I have prepared the house, and room for the camels." [3] Now the word *to prepare* means, *to remove the idols from*, which shews that without this pious arrangement the camels would have been reluctant to enter.

(2) Again: Aba Benjamin said that he had always been solicitous throughout life to have his bed placed north and south. This was out of reverence to the Shekinah, or visible glory-cloud of God's presence, which was supposed to turn east and west. R. Nama bar Hanina added to this that sons would be

[1] See Motley's "Dutch Republic," i. 44. [2] Sec. viii.
[3] Gen. xxiv. 31.

born to those who placed their bed north and south; and he derived this assurance from Psalm xvii. 11. On turning to this verse the reader will find nothing apparent to justify the inference, for it is, "Whose belly thou fillest with thy hid treasure; they have children at their desire." But the word for "treasure" means also "north;" and the Rabbi rendered the verse, "With thy north thou shalt render fruitful their bosom; they shall be satisfied with male children." [1]

(3) Here is another instance of the same kind, in one of the numberless Hagadôth which cluster round the name and fame of Moses. When he was three years old, it is said, he was sitting at a banquet with Pharaoh, and when the king took him on his knee, the child stretched out his hand, took Pharaoh's crown and placed it on his own head, from which it dropped and was broken in fragments. Disturbed and displeased, Pharaoh consults the guests as to how the Hebrew boy should be punished. Balaam, son of Beor, the magician, urged that the act was done consciously, and that the child ought to be put to death. The king assembled his judges to try the matter, and with them comes Jethro, priest of Midian, who, in his desire to save the child's life, suggests that two plates should be brought, one full of fire and one full of gold, and set before the little Moses. If he stretched out his hand for the gold it is to be inferred that he took the crown with full intelligence, and he is then to be put to death; but if he grasped the fire his life is to be spared. The plan is adopted, and when the plates are brought, the child stretches

[1] Bab. Berachôth, f. 5, b.

out his hand to the fire, and puts it to his mouth and burns his tongue. His life is accordingly spared, but it is in consequence of this accident that he becomes "slow of speech and slow of tongue" (Exod. iv. 10);[1] or, as the Hebrew might be more literally rendered, "heavy of mouth and heavy of tongue." The tale is told by Rashi on Exodus iv. 10, and Nachmanides says that God did not wish to remove this defect, because it was the consequence of a miracle.

(4) Every one knows the reputation of Solomon for magic in all eastern countries, and his legendary dominion over Ashmodai, the djins, and the afreets. Many of these fancies doubtless originated in Solomon's historic wisdom; and since he was

> The kingly sage, whose restless mind
> Through Nature's mazes wander'd unconfined,
> Who every bird, and beast, and insect knew,
> And spake of every plant that sips the dew;

we are not astonished to find that

> To him were known, so Hagar's offspring tell,
> The powerful sigil and the starry spell;
> The midnight call hell's shadowy legions dread,
> And sounds that burst the slumbers of the dead.

The probably late date of the Book of Ecclesiastes forbids us to believe that it added much to the original existence of these widely-spread legends; but there can be little doubt that the Rabbinic view of Ecclesiastes ii. 8 helped to prepare the Jewish imagination for the reception of any number of demonological stories with which his name was mixed up. Here, again, the English reader will find nothing to encourage such a superstition, for the verse is merely,

[1] Unable, according to Jewish tradition, to pronounce the labials.

"I gat me *all sorts of musical instruments.*" But the words so rendered are, *Shiddah veshiddôth*, and this was interpreted by the Talmud to mean "male and female devils;" so that the verse would record the supernatural powers of the wise king over the evil spirits.

8. Sometimes very curious fancies have gathered around some ill-understood technical term. Such is the famous legend of the worm Shamîr. One of the tasks set by the Queen of Sheba to King Solomon was to pass a thread through a diamond. Solomon was completely at a loss as to the manner in which this could be done till he had succeeded in finding and mastering the demon Ashmodai, who reveals to him that it was only to be done by means of the worm Shamîr, which Moses had used to engrave the gems of the Urim and Thummim. But how was this unknown worm to be procured? Ashmodai once more gave the only possible method. It was to seize the young of the ostrich and enclose it in a globe of crystal. The parent birds, hunting for their lost offspring, found it at last in the crystal globe. Unable to break this open with their beaks, they flew off to the hills and brought with them the worm Shamîr, which immediately penetrated the crystal. Solomon secured it, and so performed the task of the Queen of Sheba. Now what is the worm Shamîr? Nothing, apparently, but another form of the word "emery," and the legend sprang from the scientific fact that the only way to drill holes in a diamond is by means of whirling a very fine steel point on its surface with particles of emery.

9. Similar to this is the curious Hagada about the recovery of the fire from heaven, which was one of the five things lost in the period of the Exile, and was therefore missing in the second Temple. It is given in the first chapter of the Second Book of Maccabees, where we are told that at the Babylonish captivity the priests hid the sacred fire of the altar in the hollow place of a pit without water, where they kept it safe, so that the place was unknown to all men. But when on the return from captivity they revealed the secret to Nehemiah, no fire was found in the pit, but thick water. "Then commanded he them to draw it up and to bring it; and when the sacrifices were laid on, Nehemiah commanded the priests to sprinkle the wood, and the things laid thereupon, with the water. When this was done, and the time came that the sun shone, which afore was hid in the clouds, there was a great fire kindled, so that all men marvelled. Now when the sacrifice was consumed, Nehemiah commanded the water that was left to be poured on the great stones. When this was done there was kindled a flame, but it was consumed by the light that shone from the altar." After relating that the King of Persia enclosed the place and made it holy, the historian adds that "Nehemiah called this place Nephthar, . . . but many call it Nephi" (2 Macc. i. 19–36). The only explanation which can be suggested of this curious legend is that the offerings of returning captives were, in default of a miracle, set on fire by sprinkling over them some inflammable liquid; and the meaning of the word *Naptha*, which is probably connected in Hebrew with a root which

means "to drop," by some unknown error is in the Book of Maccabees said to mean "purification."[1]

10. Of Hagadôth which are simply moral allegories of degrees of merit, varying from extreme skill and insight down to the most frivolous and jejune trifling, instances might be supplied by myriads. Sometimes they assume the form of exegesis, as in the following comment on Ecclesiasties ix. 14: "There was a little city, and the men therein were few; and there came against it a great king, and besieged it, and built great bulwarks against it. Now there was found in it a poor wise man, and he by his wisdom delivered the city." The Rabbis, giving to this an allegoric turn, say that the little city is man, and the few men his different qualities. The king who besieges this city of Mansoul is the evil impulse (the *jetser ha-rang*), which is in perpetual conflict with the good impulse (the *jetser ha-tôbh*). The great bulwarks he built around it are evil deeds. The poor man who saved it represents good deeds, which even the poorest may readily perform.[2]

These homiletic illustrations are sometimes very skilful. Incomparably inferior to the most incidental of our Lord's Parables, they are yet in some instances ingenious and interesting. Out of hundreds I select the following. The Talmudists are fond of placing their great Rabbis in communication with emperors and kings, and here is a conversation between Rabbi Judah [3] and Antoninus.

[1] "The well of Nehemiah" has been identified with Bir-Eyub, or "the well of Job," near Jerusalem, and the name of the adjacent "Wady-en-Nar," or "Valley of Fire," may have some connection with the fact or the legend of a petroleum-well once discovered near that spot.

[2] See Polano, The Talmud, p. 247. [3] Called, by pre-eminence, Rabbi.

The Emperor asks the Rabbi whether, in the future world, it may not be possible for the wicked to plead that their sins were done by their bodies, and that since they are now souls without bodies, they are no longer to be held guilty?

The Rabbi in answer tells the following story. A king once had a garden of very fine figs, and wishing to secure that they shall not be stolen, he puts them under the charge of two men, of whom one was blind and one was lame. But when they were in the orchard, the lame man said to the blind man, "I see some luscious figs. Take me on your back, and I will pluck them, and we shall both enjoy them." The king, on visiting the orchard, noticed at once that his finest figs had been stolen, and summoned the custodians of the garden, to ask which of them was the thief. "Not I," said the blind man. "I could not have stolen them, for I could not see them, being blind." "Not I," said the lame man. "I could not get to the trees at all, being lame." Then the king put the lame man on the back of the blind, and punished them both. So shall it be with us. The world is the orchard; the soul and the body act as one man; both are alike guilty, and neither can the soul throw the blame on the body, nor the body on the soul. Hence it is written, "He shall call from the heaven above and to the earth to judge his people"—where *the heaven above* represents the soul, and *the earth below* the body, which is commingling with its native dust.[1]

11. This story is ingenious both in its method of illustrating a valuable truth, and in the unexpected

[1] Sanhedrin, f. 91; Weil, *Le Judaisme*, i. 156.

application given to a text of Scripture. I trace in it also a classical reminiscence. Whether Rabbi Judah had ever heard of the clever Greek epigram—

Ἀνερά τις λιπόγυιον ὑπερ νώτοιο λιπαυγὴς
ἦγε πόδας χρήσας, ὄμματα χρησάμενος[1]—

I cannot tell, but he may at any rate have been perfectly familiar with the anecdote on which it is founded, nor is it by any means a rare occurrence to trace the influence of classical reminiscence in the Hagadôth of the Talmud. Every one knows the famous story of Polycrates, as told among the golden fables of Herodotus. Believing in the watchful and wrathful jealousy of the gods against excessive prosperity, Amasis bids the fortunate tyrant of Samos to fling into the sea his most valuable treasure. Polycrates flings away an emerald ring. Soon after, a fisherman catching a particularly magnificent fish, brings it as a present to Polycrates, and on its being cut open the ring is found in its belly. The main incident of this story is found in the Talmud in the following form. A very wealthy man is informed by the astrologers that his wealth would all fall to his neighbour, a Jew, named Joseph, who is conspicuous for his observance of the Sabbath. In order to frustrate the prognostic he sells all his estate, and with the proceeds purchases a large diamond, which he sews up in his turban, convinced that Joseph can never get it. But one day when he is on board a vessel a wind rises, which blows his turban into the sea. A fish swallows the diamond. The fish is caught, and is exposed for sale in the market.

[1] A blind man carried a lame man on his back, lending him his feet, borrowing from him his eyes.—Anthol. Pal. 9, 13.

Joseph buys it on the eve of the Sabbath, and when it is opened the diamond is found, and becomes his property.

12. Besides the classical reminiscence in this story, we find in it that deeply-seated belief in a Divine Providence; that sense—triumphant or despairing according to the character and aims of him who possessed it—that

> There's a divinity which shapes our ends,
> Rough hew them how we will,

which has left its traces in the legends of all civilized races. The reader may not be sorry to see two Jewish anecdotes which are based entirely on this conviction,—the one illustrative of that heavenly guardianship which protects the just man from evil, and the other intended to show the futility of any effort to defeat the designs of heaven.

(*a*) Rabbi Akibha—says the first tale—was once travelling through the country with an ass, a cock, and a lamp. Reaching a village at nightfall, he found every place of shelter occupied, and goes into the forest, with the pious remark that "everything which God does is good." He lights his lamp, but the wind blows it out. He might well have been alarmed and disconcerted at this incident, but only remarks once more, "Everything which God does is good;" an ejaculation which he again repeats when his ass and his cock are devoured by wild beasts. Next day he learns that during the night a troop of hostile soldiers has passed through the wood. Had his ass brayed, had his cock crowed, had his light been visible, they would have murdered him. The preservation of his life has been solely due to a

Divine protection manifested in circumstances against which he might have murmured as dangerous and vexatious accidents; whereupon the pious Rabbi once more observed, "Everything which God does is good."

(*b*) The other Hagadah, Oriental rather than Talmudic, is even more striking, because it shews how men unconsciously fulfil the designs of Heaven in their very desire to defeat them. Like many of the Hagadôth, it is mixed up with Arab and Mohammedan elements, and I am unable to indicate the source from which it is derived. It is, however, in various forms, one of the numerous legends which gather round the name of Solomon.

Solomon with his chief vizier had ascended to the platform at the summit of the Temple, which was ascended by a vast flight of steps. As they stand there they see a dark figure with bowed head approaching them, who, as he comes to the foot of the stairs, gives one glance upwards and then begins to mount. In that one glance, which is directed towards himself, the terrified vizier recognizes the features of Azrael the Angel of Death, and at once implores Solomon to lend him the magic carpet, that he may be instantly transported to the topmost peak of Mount Caucasus. The request is granted, and when with slow steps Azrael has mounted to the side of Solomon, he explains to him that he had glanced up because, being bidden to bring the soul of the vizier from the top of the Caucasus, he had seen him there, standing on the Temple, with Solomon. "Angel," said the wise king, "*he awaits thee on the top of Caucasus.*"

I have endeavoured in this paper to illustrate the general character of the Hagada. Want of space has, however, prevented me from speaking of those very striking Hagadôth which, to the uninitiated reader, appear to be most absurd, because they convey hidden meaning — *φωνᾶντα συνετοῖσιν* — not understood even by many of the Jews themselves, but devized with the express intention of concealing their significance from all except a few chosen scholars or the most eminent Rabbis who uttered them. Of these I hope hereafter to furnish one or two specimens.

F. W. FARRAR.

THE WATERS OF SHILOAH.

ISAIAH viii. 6.

THE very simplicity and pertinence of words addressed to one generation often render them obscure to the generations that come after, especially if they come long after and spring from a different stock. The more closely indeed that words fit into and express the experience of a by-gone generation, the more remote are they from us who have passed through a different experience and have been trained in a wholly dissimilar series of traditions. Before we can hope to understand them, we must study the conditions of that generation, the hopes and fears by which they were swayed, and look at them, in short, as far as possible from their point of view.

Thus, for example, to the Hebrews who lived during the reign of Remaliah's son, who feared king Rezin his ally, and who had often drunk of the softly-flowing stream of Shiloah, the reproach of

the Prophet would be full of significance; while for us, though we can hardly fail to catch his tone of reproach, his meaning is wholly lost, or can only be painfully recovered. Its very allusions to Rezin, and Remaliah's son, and "Siloah's sacred flood," which would bring home the reproach to the men of that generation, and render it at once picturesque and forcible, obscure its meaning and pertinence for us. Before we can so much as apprehend in what direction it points, we must translate it into terms in modern use; we must patiently trace out the purport of the historical allusions by which its meaning was conveyed to the Jews but is concealed from us.

"But shall we be repaid for our trouble if we enter on this tedious and difficult inquiry?"

That will hardly be doubted when I so far anticipate the results of our inquiry as to say that, in their last resort, these words, so obscure and mysterious as yet, convey a rebuke to those who put their trust in the powers of this visible and passing world, instead of trusting in Christ, the Sent One of God, and the Saviour of the world.

Two facts we must bear well in mind from the very outset of our brief inquiry. The first is that the phrase—"the waters of Shiloah"—is simply an ancient and poetic name for that pool of Siloam in which our Lord bade the blind man wash in order that he might receive his sight.[1] The second is that the generation to whom this reproach was addressed lived long after the division of the holy nation into the rival kingdoms of Judah and Israel. Between these two kingdoms there was always a latent, and

[1] John ix. 7.

often an open, hostility. As the conflict between them passed into its more fatal and malignant phases, the neighbouring nations were drawn into it, and made their profit of it,—Syria being, for the most part, the ally of Israel, and Assyria the ally of Judah.

1. Now "Rezin" was the king of Syria at the time that "Remaliah's son," Pekah, was king of Israel. These two, Pekah and Rezin, had conspired against Judah. They had invaded it, and attempted to take Jerusalem by assault, although as yet they had not succeeded in the attempt. When tidings of this confederacy came to Ahaz, the king of Judah, his heart and the heart of his people were "moved as the trees of the wood are moved by the wind;"[1] they were agitated and bowed down with fear. The prophet Isaiah is sent to calm their fears, to stay and reassure their hearts. He comes with the gracious promise, "Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and thou shalt call his name Immanuel.

"But that is a prophecy of Messiah's advent; and what has that to do with the fear of Ahaz and his people? They were foreboding the fatal issue of a present war, and they are told of the advent of a Redeemer who, some seven centuries afterward, is to come on a spiritual mission; of the advent of a Messiah who, long after they are gathered to their fathers, is to bring salvation to their remote descendants! What help or solace was that to them in their pressing and critical emergency?"

If the promise meant nothing more than this, if it spake only of the advent of a future Redeemer, it

[1] Isaiah vii. 2.

must be admitted that it would have been little adapted to the immediate and urgent wants of the moment, and would have carried little comfort to the hearts of those to whom it was addressed. But, besides its future prophetic meaning, the promise had a literal and immediate significance. The virgin prophetess, *Isaiah's bride*, was to conceive and bring forth a son. *His* name was to be Immanuel ("God with us"), to shew that God would be with his people in their present strait. Before *this* Immanuel —the living prophet's son—was old enough to discern between good and evil, both the kings whom Judah feared and abhorred—both "Rezin," king of Syria, and "Remaliah's son," king of Israel—were to be utterly destroyed and their land dispeopled. *This* was to be the stay and solace of the men of Judah, that, within a few years, the enemies who troubled and dismayed them were to be overthrown. The prophetic meaning of the promise, the coming of the true Immanuel, was for *our* teaching and comfort; the birth of the typical Immanuel, an event close at hand, was to be *their* comfort and support in their imminent distress and peril.

Even this promise, however, near as its fulfilment was, did not suffice to allay the storm of fear which swept through the heart of Judah as the wind rushes through the wood. So far from discerning the prophetic meaning of the promise, King Ahaz could not wait for its literal fulfilment, nay, could not trust it when it was fulfilled. In a few months the Prophetess brought forth a son, whom the Prophet, her husband, named Immanuel. To every faithful heart this boy was an express sign that God had not

abandoned them, that He was with them and would deliver them. But there were not many faithful hearts in Judah. It was not enough, whether for king or people, to have God with them: they must have man too. Heaven was a long way off; Syria, close at hand. God might be able to deliver them; but there could be little doubt that Syria was able to crush them. And there lay the Syrian host, a very present portent and dread, pressing in hard upon their metropolis, endangering the very Temple; and yet God's arm was not stretched out to defend his own. It would be wise to appeal to the nearer, quicker, surer help of man; to make or renew an alliance with the king of Assyria and to entreat immediate succour. These credulous sceptics, believing in "big battalions," but not in the circumambient host of God, had their will. The Assyrian monarch invaded, first, the kingdom of Syria. Rezin was called home to defend his own territory, and was slain in the siege of Damascus. Then the Assyrian invaded the kingdom of Israel, and took town after town, till at last his own servants conspired against the son of Remaliah, and slew him. *Thus* the promise of God was fulfilled despite the unbelief of the Jews, and both the kings who put Judah in fear were miserably destroyed.[1]

Here, then, the lamp of history begins to shine on this obscure passage, and to make its meaning clear. "This people," we may say, "who rejoiced in Rezin and Remaliah's son," were the people of Israel. Remaliah's son was their king. Rezin, king of Syria, was his faithful ally. They had conspired

[1] See 2 Kings xv. and 2 Chron. xxviii.

against Judah, and invaded it, destroying "a hundred and twenty thousand valiant men," and carrying off two hundred thousand captives, with an immense spoil. So great a victory, a campaign so fortunate, a booty so large, might well inflame the pride of their subjects. They grew boastful and exultant; they "rejoiced" or gloried in the two kings who had enriched them with plunder and led them to a triumph so complete.

2. But, again: the people who put their trust, who exulted, in the kings of Israel and Syria, also "refused the waters of Shiloah that go softly." What may *that* mean? what was this second offence against Heaven? For an answer to this question we must turn from the historical to the natural facts here alluded to. "The waters of Shiloah" took their rise on Mount Moriah, "the hill of the Lord," the hill on which the Temple was built. Indeed, the spring is said to have risen within the very precincts of the Temple, and to have supplied its courts and cisterns with the abundant water required for its innumerable washings and sacrifices. From the summit of the hill it now flows gently to its base, not along any external channel however, but through a secret tunnel which it seems to have worn for itself through the solid rock. Its waters, therefore, flow under ground, running far before they meet the light of day. And, when they re-emerge, they rise and flow without noise or turbulence. They form no brawling torrent, no swift and angry stream, sweeping away its banks and carrying havoc before it. Softly and gently they rise and fill the pool. Softly and gently they overflow into a placid stream, a

stream that does not fail even in times of drought; a stream that quickens all it touches into life, and reveals its presence only by the beauty and fertility which mark its course. This is no imaginary description adapted to the requirements of the passage before us, but a description given by a traveller who stood on its margin and tracked its course only a few years since. And yet how admirably it illustrates the Prophet's words—"The waters of Shiloah that go *softly*;" or, as the Hebrew word also means, *secretly*. They *do* go both secretly and softly. They flow unseen for a while; and when they emerge from their rocky tunnel, they do not rush and fret and whiten in their course, as most hill streams do, but lapse gently on, carrying with them a belt of verdure to the very margin of the Dead Sea. The words of Isaiah describe the waters of Shiloah as they remain to this day.

And now we may see, in part, the significance and force of the reproach, "This people *refuseth* the waters of Shiloah." For the stream of Siloam, which rose within the Temple precincts, is here used as a symbol of the Temple and of its worship. This worship the ten tribes of Israel had long since abandoned. They had turned aside to idols. They bowed before the golden calves which Jeroboam had set up, instead of bending before the mercy-seat of Jehovah. Nay, more and worse: in place of putting their trust in the invisible God, of whom even the golden calves were at first intended to be visible emblems, they were putting their trust in man, "rejoicing in Rezin and Remaliah's son," believing that these two kings, who had already gratified their lust for plunder and

victory, were better able to serve and succour them than the very gods they worshipped. Jehovah, indeed, had promised to be with them as He was with their fathers, to preserve them from their enemies, to bless them in their ways. But they could not see Him. His arm moved softly and secretly—noiselessly and without display. They craved, they preferred, a more palpable and obvious defence and support. The waters of Siloam ran too softly for them; the word and providence of God were too gentle and unobtrusive to command their confidence. Jehovah was far away, Rezin and Pekah close at hand. *He* moved toward his ends quietly, like the light which dawns gradually and noiselessly upon the world; *they*, suddenly and noisily, amid the confused tumults of battle, like the lightning which smites and scathes and stuns. And therefore the people of Israel refused the sacred but secret stream of Siloah, and rejoiced in their victorious monarch and his Syrian ally.

This, then, is the first and most obvious meaning of the passage, as it stands. The Israelites rejected the secret and invisible ministries of the Temple and of Him who dwelt in the Temple, and were glorying in human strength, human valour, human alliances.

3. But we may find another meaning in it, or another application of the same meaning; nay, we *must* find this other meaning in it if, as probably we ought to do, we translate the passage, with Hitzig, "This people *dreadeth* Rezin and Remaliah's son." For, in that case, it is the people of Judah, rather than the people of Israel, who are rebuked by the Prophet. *They* were putting their trust in men, in

princes. They dreaded the might of the two monarchs who had come up against them. They could not feel secure until they could pit the king of Assyria against the king of Syria, and go out to war with foreign allies as numerous and as powerful as those of Israel.

And *their* sin, the sin of a falsely-placed trust, was more heinous in them than in their brethren of Israel. For they still clung to the Temple, still worshipped the Jehovah of their fathers. By all the ties of habit and worship, by all the nobler traditions of their race and kingdom, they were bound to make *Him* their strength and stay. To quicken and deepen their reliance on Him, God had given them both a special word of promise, and in Immanuel, the son of the Prophet, a special and most gracious sign. The very name of this child was a new assurance that God was with them, that He had not forgotten to be gracious to them. But, like their kinsmen of Israel, "this people" of Judah refused the waters of Shiloah, because they ran softly. The Divine energy working invisibly through the events and changes of their daily life, working still more potently through the acts of worship in the Temple, and the gracious assurance latent in the word of promise and in Immanuel, the sign of the promise—these required a spiritual insight and affection of which they were destitute. It was easier for them to rest on outward forces, on the valour of captains and armies, on the might of great conquerors and monarchs; and therefore they betook themselves to the king of Assyria, and the vast hosts he could summon to his standard, and put their trust in these.

And verily they had their reward. The Assyrian listened to their urgent appeal. He came and destroyed their enemies, but he also "stretched out" his terrible wings over *them*. Judah, as well as Israel, was "brought very low." It was "stript naked." The ally whom they had called in "distressed them, but did not strengthen them."

4. There is still another, and a wider, meaning in these words. All the Hebrew prophets, and Isaiah among them, use the kingdoms of Syria and of Assyria as types of the great world-power, of those external forces of every kind in which it is our constant temptation to trust rather than in the Maker of heaven and earth. To the Jewish people, dwelling in their scattered village communities, with their self-elected judges and leaders—to this people, who were held together by religious rather than by political ties, the vast organized despotisms beyond their borders were a strangely impressive and terrible spectacle. It is impossible to read the inspired prophecies and chronicles without perceiving that the national imagination was dominated, that it was now attracted and now daunted, by the immense power of these great instruments of conquest and oppression; without perceiving that in the minds both of prophets and of the people these despotisms came to stand for all the hostile and seductive forces of that world which is without God and even opposes itself against Him.

It was in these vulgar, unspiritual, but tremendous forces, that the men both of Judah and of Israel were now trusting. Compared with the great despotisms of the East, and the men who wielded them, what

was the child Immanuel, although he was a sign of the Divine Presence, or what "the waters of Shiloah," although it too was the symbol of the Divine Presence and favour? We must not judge these men too harshly if the loud, near, and obvious forces of the great Eastern despotisms took greater bulk and weight in their minds than those Divine influences which ran softly and secretly among them, making neither show nor noise. Nor, on the other hand, must we fail to note that, in preferring the alliance of Syria and Assyria to the help of God, they were virtually renouncing their special prerogative, the peculiar hope and consolation of Israel. For just as those ancient despotisms were prophetic types of the forces of the outward world, so the son of Isaiah was a type of the true Immanuel, and the waters of Siloah a type of the quickening and cleansing ministry of Him who was sent of God to take away the sin of the world. To refuse the waters of Shiloah for the sake of Rezin and Remaliah's son, to pay so little heed to the promise and significance of the birth of Immanuel, was virtually therefore to reject the God whom they professed to worship, and to renounce the hope to which they had been called. It was to prefer man to God. It was to be conformed to the world, and alienated from the Christ.

Of course this identification of the pool of Siloam, of "the living water" of the ancient Temple, with the ministry and salvation of Christ, seems questionable and far-fetched until its Scriptural ground and authority be adduced. That ground and authority may be found in Chapter ix. of St. John's Gospel. In the earlier verses of that Chapter we read of a man

born blind to whom the Lord Jesus, as He passed from the Temple, gave sight. Discussing the condition of this blind man with his disciples, our Lord affirms that *He* has come forth from the Father in order that "the works of God may be manifested;" and that, so long as it is day, He must "work the works of Him that *sent*" Him: that is to say, He virtually calls Himself, here as elsewhere, "*the Sent One* of God." Then, turning to the blind man, He anoints his eyes, and bids him, "Go, wash in the pool of Siloam; which"—Siloam, viz.—adds the Apostle in a parenthesis, "is by interpretation, *Sent.*" The blind man had not far to go. From the Temple he would pass down the slope of the hill on which it stood, grope his way to the pool in the valley, wash in it, and return seeing.

But what we have specially to note is the parenthesis of St. John. No sooner has he told us that Jesus declared Himself to be "sent" of the Father, than he also tells us that Siloam means "sent;" the implication being that just as Christ was *sent*, so also the waters of Siloam were *sent* by God, and were his gift to the world. The Commentators are agreed that the Apostle adds this parenthesis in order to teach us that the cleansing healing spring, which gave sight to the blind and kept the Temple pure, was a symbol of the Messiah, and of his cleansing and enlightening ministry. He tells us that Siloam meant "Sent of God" in order that we may recognize in Christ the true Siloam—Him by whose virtue the sick are healed and the service of God is sanctified. So that, in fine, to refuse the waters of Shiloah that go softly, and to dread or to

glory in Rezin and Remaliah's son, is, in the last resort, to put our trust in the forces of this visible and passing world, instead of trusting in Christ, the Sent One of God and the Saviour of the world.

5. A very beautiful and suggestive meaning is thus reached. For now the passage, so obscure at first, sets Christ before us as *the Sent One of God*, the true Siloam. He came forth from the Father, not to do his own will, but the will of Him that sent Him. And, therefore, we are not to conceive of Him as mitigating or placating the Father's anger, but as disclosing and expressing the Father's love. He is God's gift to us—his one all-including all-guaranteeing gift. He is the Fountain of Life in the spiritual Temple, a fountain opened for all sin and uncleanness; a fountain whose waters are of so sovereign a virtue that they avail to wash away even the foulest stains and to quicken all that were sometime dead. Coming to Him, we are made every whit clean, every whit whole. The Sent One is sent to and for all. The true Siloam is for the healing of all nations.

The passage sets Christ before us in *the might of his gentleness.* The waters of Shiloah go softly, secretly. They run underground for a while; and, when they emerge to sight, it is without rush or noise. Overflowing the basin of the Pool, they flow gently and shyly on their way, hiding themselves beneath the wealth of life and verdure they create. And, in like manner, Jesus did not strive, nor cry, nor make a noise in the streets. He sought no publicity, no fame. His mightiest works were done in secret, or in the presence of a few chosen witnesses. His most select and critical hours were spent in the

solitudes of the mountain, the garden, the desert—alone, yet not alone, because God was with Him. His course through life, like that of the sacred hill stream, was to be traced by the blessings He shed around Him, the added life and fruitfulness He carried to prepared and fertile hearts, the new life and fruitfulness He carried to barren hearts. Under the gentle, unobtrusive, yet irresistible influence of his grace, how many a solitary place has grown glad with flowers and fruit! how many a desert place has blossomed and rejoiced like the rose!

The passage sets Christ before us as *rejected by his own.* "His own received him not." They refused the waters of Shiloah—refused them precisely because they ran softly. Had they brawled down a rocky bed, fretting and whitening against every stone that opposed their progress, they might have proved attractive; they might have commanded attention. Had Jesus come to reveal his power instead of to display his mercy, blazing fierce wrath upon his enemies and smiting hostile nations to the earth, the Jews would probably have received Him and rejoiced in Him. But He came not with observation. One day He will come as the lightning which flashes from one end of heaven to the other: but of old He came in great humility. And the Jews, like their fathers, refused the Divine Gentleness that would have made them great, and relied on the human might which oppressed and enslaved them. Just as the fathers rejected Jehovah to put their trust in the kings of Syria and Assyria, so the children rejected Jesus and put their trust in Caiaphas and Pilate. And we are in danger of falling into their sin. It is

hard to hold fast our faith in God, and the invisible operations of his law, and the secret equity of his providence, when a slight exertion of our own craft, or a little help from our neighbours, seems all we need to secure our immediate and certain good. It is our constant temptation to put our trust in men—in our own cunning or our own might, or in our neighbours' might and cunning—instead of holding fast our confidence in God and in the blessedness of obedience to his law. And, therefore, we need to remember the doom of those who refused the softly-flowing waters of Shiloah, and rejoiced in Rezin and Remaliah's son; that, warned by their doom, we may not share their sin. S. COX.

IV.

THAT CHRIST SPOKE GREEK.

I NOW proceed to a consideration of the objections which may be urged against the view that Greek was the dominant language of Palestine in the times of Christ and his apostles. Such objections are to be expected. For as there is no proposition which does not contain a contradiction in terms but may possibly be true, so there is no proposition which does not rest on mathematical evidence but will be found in some measure open to objections, and must, however certain in itself, be defended against them.

The first objection to be noticed is of a purely *a priori* character. It rests on the alleged tenacity of vernacular language, and is usually accompanied by

a statement of the special unlikelihood which is supposed to have existed in the case of the Jews that any other tongue should have gained supremacy over their ancient national language. This objection need not long detain us, for the appeal must here, as in every such case, be made to facts. The decisive question is, Was it, or was it not, the case that, in our Saviour's days, the Greek language had obtained prevalence in Palestine? It is only if no certain evidence exists that we can allow the *a priori* principle any weight in determining our judgment. All mere presumptive reasoning must yield in the face of actual proof. Its very strongest conclusions vanish at once when shewn to be inconsistent with even the smallest amount of incontrovertible fact; and therefore, while far from acknowledging the validity of the objection in the principle which it involves, I may be content simply to point to the evidence already brought forward to demonstrate its inapplicability in the special case which has engaged our consideration. Many and varied proofs have been adduced to shew that Greek *was* in reality the reigning language of Palestine in the time of Christ; and unless these proofs can be repelled, the result to which they lead remains totally unaffected by any *a priori* considerations. They present the stubborn resistance ever offered by facts to all mere theories, however plausible; and if they cannot be questioned or set aside, they demand, with the imperial authority of truth, to be accepted in all their length and breadth, and with all their manifest and legitimate conclusions.

This *a priori* objection to the views which I have

advocated, though so inherently weak, is a very favourite weapon with a certain class of writers on the opposite side of the question. Such arguments as the following are continually employed: "We cannot conceive that Greek was employed by our Saviour and his disciples;" "The Jews were too tenacious of all that was national and peculiar ever to have parted with their ancestral language;" "How can we doubt that Hebrew was the dialect which our Lord and his contemporaries made use of?" &c. Now I crave leave to retire from this ground altogether, not from any fear of being beaten on it, but because it is not the ground on which the controversy can ever be settled. The question is purely one of *fact*, and nothing else can properly be allowed any weight in deciding it. Let the opponents of those views which have been here presented leave the shadowy realm of presumptive reasoning altogether, and let us meet on the substantial ground of actual evidence, where alone the contest can find issue, and where the irresistible testimony of truth may be proved to belong either to the one side or the other.

It is then with a feeling of satisfaction that I proceed to a consideration of those *a posteriori* arguments by which the conclusions aimed at in these papers are sought to be invalidated. Many of these arguments bear only against the opinion that Hebrew, in the form of Aramaic, was not employed for *any* purpose by the Jews of our Saviour's day, and present, therefore, no really hostile aspect to the views for which I contend. It is idle to prove that Aramaic was frequently used by the contemporaries of Christ and his disciples. The evidence of that fact

is, I believe, abundant and conclusive. I willingly admit that the Jews of the period were, generally speaking, δίγλωττοι, and I entertain no doubt that they often found it convenient and agreeable to employ their national language. But the admission of this fact does not in any way controvert the thesis which I have propounded. Both truths rest on their own appropriate evidence; and the many proofs which may be brought forward to shew that the Jews were then acquainted with Aramaic, and often made use of it, stand in perfect harmony with the parallel proofs which have been adduced to evince that they were equally well acquainted with Greek, and generally employed it for all public and literary purposes.

These remarks furnish a sufficient reply to the objection based on several passages in Josephus,[1] in which the historian reports that, by the command of Titus, he addressed his besieged countrymen, τῇ πατρίῳ γλώσσῃ and Ἑβραΐζων. Of course the Jews understood Aramaic, and, for fanatical reasons, had then fallen back upon its use much more than at a somewhat earlier period of their history. But that fact certainly does not disprove what we so clearly learn from the same writer, that they were also familiarly acquainted with the Greek language.

There are two other passages generally quoted from Josephus,[2] in the former of which he speaks of the Greek as a ξένη καὶ ἀλλοδαπὴ διάλεκτος, which every one admits it to have been; and in the latter tells us that he had devoted himself to the study of Greek learning, but had not been able to acquire a correct

[1] *Wars*, v. 9, 2; vi. 2, 1. [2] *Antiq.* Prooem. 2; *Antiq.* xx. 11, 2.

pronunciation, on account of the habit which prevailed in his native country. The whole difficulty which this passage seems to present vanishes when we take into account the object which Josephus had professedly in view. It was not his purpose merely to write in Greek, but in pure and classical Greek; and it is in perfect consistency with the position which I uphold that he should have felt great difficulty in accomplishing this purpose. His *πάτριος συνήθεια* greatly hindered it. His case was analogous to those Scottish writers of the last century (Campbell, for instance, in the preface to his work on the Gospels), who speak of the pains which they had taken, often, as was felt, with but partial success, to write in correct and classical English. The Hebraistic Greek to which Josephus was accustomed in Palestine might almost have been reckoned a different language from that employed by the classical historians. It was therefore an onerous task which he undertook when he engaged to write an account of the institutions of his country on the model of native Greek writers; and we wonder not that he required all the assistance he could procure in this undertaking, and excused the delay which had occurred in the publication of his work by a statement of the difficulty he had experienced in composing it.

It is next contended that there is no evidence of the Septuagint translation having been used in the synagogues of Judæa, as might have been expected if the Greek language prevailed in that country. This objection has been strongly pressed by many learned writers, and in a tone of triumph which seems to indicate that it is deemed unanswerable. Never-

theless, as appears to me, it is an objection which when examined resolves itself into another confirmation of the views here sought to be established.

What then, I beg to ask, is the nature of the evidence demanded on the point in question? Is it no evidence that we find the passages quoted by our Lord in the synagogues (see Luke iv. 16–20; John vi. 26–35) agreeing almost *verbatim* with the version of the LXX.? Is it no evidence that we learn from the Gospels throughout that the ancient Scriptures were read in the synagogues of Palestine in a language well understood by the people, and are at the same time sure that the Biblical Hebrew was then totally unintelligible to most of them, while we have no proof that any written version of the Old Testament ever existed except that of the LXX.? Is it no evidence that we find the earliest Fathers of the Church, who lived in times bordering on those of the apostles, unanimously speaking of the Septuagint as in habitual use among the Jews; and that it is not till we come down to Jerome that we find any doubts suggested as to that Version having been employed by our Lord and his apostles? To my mind every available source of evidence which is worth anything points to the conclusion that the Greek translation of the Old Testament Scriptures was then regularly used in the synagogues of Palestine. Let us subject the question to the test of history. We see our Lord entering the synagogue at Nazareth, and having a book put into his hands, from which He reads in the hearing of the people. In what language was that book composed? This question, if it can be answered, is decisive of the point under discussion. Nor does

there seem much difficulty in answering it. We know, beyond all dispute, that ancient Hebrew could not have been the language of the book, since that was then unintelligible to the great body of the people. The ground is narrowed, then, to the old question between the Septuagint translation, which was certainly then in existence, and a written Chaldee paraphrase, which is summoned into being for the occasion. One should imagine that if there is anything required to decide between these competing claims, it is found in the twofold fact, that no proof can be brought from the New Testament that even an oral Chaldee paraphrase was then usually given in the synagogues of Palestine, and that the passage referred to is preserved by the Evangelist in almost the exact words of the Septuagint version.

And then, if we look at the statements of the early Christian writers, we find that with the greatest unanimity they corroborate this conclusion. Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and Tertullian all contain statements which clearly testify to the habitual use of the version of the LXX. among the Jews. It was not, as has been already remarked, till the time of Jerome, that the idea began to spread that any other form of the ancient Scriptures was generally employed by our Lord and his disciples. In short, as there is nothing more than assertions to be found that the Old Testament Scriptures existed in any other form among the Jews of our Saviour's day than in the Hebrew original and the Greek translation, and as they certainly were not read by our Lord and his contemporaries only in a dead language, we necessarily conclude, in full accordance with the impression

derived from the earliest Christian and Jewish writers, and above all from the records contained in the New Testament, that the Greek version of the Old Testament was in our Saviour's time regularly read in the synagogues of Palestine.

Advancing now to a consideration of the objections derived from the New Testament itself, I shall notice very briefly, in the first place, those Aramaic words and phrases which occasionally present themselves, and on the occurrence of which not a little is often based. In fact, the few Hebrew words which are found in our Lord's discourses have been frequently referred to as decisive of the whole question at issue. The fallacy involved in such a mode of argument was formerly pointed out. It was remarked that nothing could be more natural than that such terms should from time to time occur if the relation of the two languages were such as is here supposed. It was also shewn how difficult it is to account for the retention of these few words in their original form on the hypothesis that the language employed by our Lord and his disciples has for the most part been translated. By all the rules of logic, indeed, the occurrence of those few Aramaic words which appear in the New Testament, so far from proving that that was the usual language of Christ and his followers, rather proves the contrary, and leads us to conclude that they generally made use of the Greek language.

Again, we are told by St. Paul, in the narrative of his conversion given before Agrippa (Acts xxvi. 14), that the exalted Saviour then spoke to him "in the Hebrew tongue." The inference which many have drawn from this is, that Hebrew was then the pre-

vailing language of the country, and the language, accordingly, which our Lord habitually made use of during his sojourn upon the earth. But this way of viewing the matter deprives the Apostle's statement of all significance. If Hebrew had been the usual language of public intercourse at the time, and the language habitually spoken by Christ, what need was there for the Apostle to remark that it was now made use of by the Saviour? All his hearers would of course suppose this, had it been true that Aramaic was the language generally employed. The very fact that St. Paul regards the matter as worthy of being mentioned, shews that the occurrence was exceptional, and that it was therefore a thing which would not naturally suggest itself to the minds of his audience. We are thus led to the old conclusion—Greek, and not Hebrew, was the language commonly made use of in Palestine as the medium of public intercourse; and in accordance with this, the Apostle now mentions it as something singular and striking that he was, on this occasion, addressed by the Saviour in Aramaic, and not in the usual Greek, which might have been expected to be employed.

It is hardly needful, after what has already been said, to do more than notice the objection, brought forward by some, to the effect that "it is scarcely credible that the poor woman who came out of the coasts of Tyre and Sidon could have uttered her cries and lamentations in *Greek*. She spoke the native language of her country. It was Syro-Phœnician or Syro-Chaldaic, and the same mixed language, with some variety of dialect, prevailed at that time over Judæa, Samaria, and Galilee. There seems the

highest probability that most of our Saviour's conversation with the scribes and Pharisees, and that all his addresses to the common people, were spoken in this vernacular tongue; but when it was subsequently ordered that the New Testament should be composed in Hellenistic Greek, they were enabled by that Divine power which we term inspiration to convert this provincial and transient dialect into its present fixed and enduring form."[1] This is a delicious passage, as exhibiting long-prevalent views in all their crudeness. No answer to it is required beyond referring to what has been proved above. Few, I imagine, will be inclined to attribute the Greek of the New Testament to inspiration if it can be accounted for on natural grounds; and equally few, I trust, will find any difficulty in believing that a woman of Tyre and Sidon, who is expressly styled by St. Mark Ἑλληνίς, addressed her petition to Christ in the Greek language.

Again, it is objected that we read (Matt. xxvi. 73; Mark xiv. 70) that Peter was discovered to be a native of Galilee by the dialect which he employed, and must therefore have been speaking the vernacular language. Granting that this was the case, it proves nothing against the proposition which I have endeavoured to establish. It is, on the contrary, in closest accordance with the view which has been here exhibited of the relation subsisting between the two languages. It was exactly in such circumstances as those referred to that we should expect the vulgar tongue of the country to be employed; and it is surely nothing strange that the dialect of it which

[1] Grinfield's "Apology for the Septuagint," p. 12.

Peter was accustomed at times to speak in Galilee should now be stated to have been found somewhat different from that generally prevalent in Jerusalem.

We find another objection sometimes derived from the question of the Roman officer to Paul (Acts xxi. 37), "Canst thou speak Greek?" With strange perversity, Father Simon says, regarding this question, that it "implies a supposition that *all the Jews of Jerusalem* did not speak in that tongue." The plain truth is that the words have no reference to the Jews of Jerusalem, or any other Jews, at all. This is obvious from what follows. The Roman soldier had imagined that Paul was a notorious Egyptian bandit, and, rightly or wrongly, had concluded that in that case he would be ignorant of Greek. As soon as he heard the Apostle make use of that language, he expressed his surprise, and exclaimed, "Thou art not then (better thus than interrogative, as in our Authorized Version) that Egyptian, which before these days madest an uproar, and leddest out into the wilderness four thousand men that were murderers." The words have thus no bearing whatever on the language of Palestine. And Paul by his answer shews that, whatever might be supposed to hold good in the case of the rude Egyptian referred to, it was nothing remarkable that a Jew like himself should be found acquainted with Greek. "I am," said he, "a Jew of Tarsus, and I beseech thee suffer me to speak to the people,"—a request which the chief captain immediately granted, doubtless expecting, as we shall soon see the people of Jerusalem themselves did, that Paul would now address the multitude in the Greek language.

Another objection, or quasi-objection, is derived curiously enough from the languages in which the accusation placed over the cross of our Lord was written. Some have argued that Hebrew was employed because that was the only language known by the inhabitants of the city, while Greek was used merely for the sake of those Gentiles, or foreign Jews, who were then present in Jerusalem. But such an argument has no real foundation. The statement made (Luke xxiii. 38), that the superscription over the Redeemer's cross "was written in letters of Greek and Latin and Hebrew," does in fact furnish an excellent illustration of the views which I have set forth as to the relation then subsisting between the languages of Palestine. There was, first of all, the Greek, almost universally employed and understood, used especially for all literary purposes and on all public occasions. There was, next, the Hebrew or Aramaic, commonly made use of in familiar intercourse by the natives of the country, but the employment of which was scarcely a matter of necessity to any. And there was, last of all, the Latin, a tongue scarcely ever heard among the Jewish inhabitants, but employed by their Roman rulers, as being the imperial language, for all official purposes. Many similar cases might be quoted. Thus we are told that when the youthful son of James II. was acknowledged by Louis XIV. as heir of the crown of England, this was done "in Latin, French, and English."[1] On this occasion French alone would probably have served every practical purpose, just as Greek alone would have been prac-

[1] Macaulay's "History of England," v. 294.

tically sufficient in regard to the inscription placed upon the cross. But in both cases there were formal reasons why the three languages should be used.

I have reserved to the last some remarks on another passage in the Acts, which is often referred to with peculiar confidence as militating against the proposition which I have been seeking to establish. We are told (Chap. xxii. 2) that "when the Jews heard that Paul spake to them in the Hebrew tongue, they kept the more silence;" these last words especially being rested on by those who contend that our Lord and his disciples *must* have employed the Aramaic language. But a careful consideration of all these circumstances is quite sufficient to explain, in full consistency with the views which I have advocated, and even as still further illustrating and confirming them, both the fact that the apostle now made use of Hebrew, and the other fact that his hearers were agreeably surprised at being addressed by him in that language.

Let the reader then observe, as is obvious on a single glance at the narrative, that the Jews clearly *expected* on this occasion not to be addressed in Hebrew, but Greek — a point which proves both their familiarity with that language and the habitual use which was made of it in public intercourse. It is manifest, therefore, from this very passage, that in accordance with what has been so repeatedly urged in these papers, Hebrew was not in that age the ordinary medium of communication employed by public speakers or instructors in Palestine.

Why, then, it will be asked, did the Apostle now

make choice of it? and why were the Jews inclined to hear him more patiently on perceiving that he employed it? Evidently, as appears to me, from the special circumstances in which, relatively to his auditors, the apostle was then placed. In the immediately preceding context we learn that a great uproar had been excited among the Jews on account of St. Paul's fancied opposition to all that they deemed most sacred. On perceiving him in the Temple, some Jews of Asia had cried out, saying, "Men of Israel, help: This is the man that teacheth all men everywhere against the people, and the law, and this place: and further brought Greeks also into the temple, and hath polluted this holy place." Now, such being the nature of the suspicions with which the minds of the Jews were filled against him, nothing was more fitted to win for him a favourable hearing, if that were possible, than at once to commence his address to them in their national language. His adoption of the Hebrew tongue was an instant witness in his favour. It proved that he was not so utterly estranged from all that was specially Jewish as his enemies had represented; and no sooner, accordingly, had the sound of the old ancestral language been heard from his lips, than the prepossessions against him lost much of their force, and there was manifested a greater disposition to hear him patiently.

This seems to me the only satisfactory explanation of the passage. To infer from it that Hebrew was the usual language of public address at this time, is not only opposed to the narrative itself, but serves to strip the conduct of the apostle of all its meaning.

Yet that has not unfrequently been done. Thus, Dean Milman speaks of St. Paul's employment of Hebrew on this occasion as being "absolutely necessary, in order to make himself intelligible to the people." [1] According to such a view, Paul had no option in respect to the language which he employed. It was essential that he should speak to the multitude of Jews around him in Hebrew, simply that they might understand him, and thus mere common sense dictated the employment of that language. But, surely, that is not what the narrative suggests. There was a deliberate choice made by the Apostle as to the language in which he should speak. And, on the ground which I maintain, his conduct at this time manifested that prudence and skill by which it was in general so remarkably distinguished. It cannot be doubted that, prevalent as the Greek tongue then was in Palestine, the Jews, like any other nation, would be pleased on such an occasion as the present, when their prejudices had been violently excited, to listen so unexpectedly to the accents of their national tongue. And St. Paul, with that consummate wisdom which led him to become "all things to all men," now adapted himself to that most natural feeling. To the Jew he became as a Jew, for the purpose of obtaining a friendly hearing; just as formerly at Athens he had, for the same end, become as a Greek to the Greek, and expressed himself in the language and style of an accomplished Grecian.

We have thus found fancied objections really changing into additional confirmations of the views

[1] Bampton Lecture, p. 184.

sought to be established. And this is a very convincing sort of evidence. To quote the words of Sir John Herschel :—"The surest and best characteristic of a well-founded and extensive induction is when verifications of it spring up, as it were, spontaneously into notice from the quarters where they might be least expected, or even among instances of that very kind which were at first considered hostile to them. Evidence of this kind is irresistible, and compels assent with a weight which scarcely any other possesses." [1]

It has been proved then, I believe, beyond the reach of all reasonable objection, and from the undeniable facts of New Testament history, that Greek and not Hebrew was the common language of public intercourse in Palestine in the days of Christ and his apostles. And if this has been done, we may be allowed to express some gratification at the thought that, in our existing Greek Gospels we possess, in the form in which they were uttered, the words of Him to whom the illustrious testimony was borne—"Never man spake like this man." *He* spoke in Greek, and his disciples did the same while they reported what He said. Their inspiration consisted not, as has been thought, in being enabled to give perfect translations, either of discourses delivered or of documents written in the Hebrew language, but in being led under Divine guidance to transfer to paper for the benefit of all coming ages those words of the Great Teacher which they had heard from his own lips in the Greek tongue; which had in that form been imprinted on their affectionate memories; and which were by them

[1] "Discourse on the Study of Natural Philosophy." 180.

in the same language faithfully committed to writing, while they literally experienced a fulfilment of the gracious promise, — "The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you."

A. ROBERTS.

THE GOSPEL IN THE EPISTLES.

I believe that Jesus Christ rose again from the dead, that he ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty, and from thence shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

On these doctrines of the Christian faith the Epistles with which we are dealing are quite as explicit in their statements as the Gospels, and we therefore propose only to quote one or two passages from them, for to cite all their expressions on the resurrection of Jesus, the greatest theme of Christian teaching, would be to quote whole chapters of the Epistles *in extenso*. But that there may be no doubt about what St. Paul understood by the resurrection of Jesus Christ, it will be well to cite a few of his expressions on the subject before we proceed further. In the Epistle to the Romans (vi. 8–10) he writes: "Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him: knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him. For in that he died, he died unto sin once: but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God." There is no question that in the first clause of this passage the Apostle is speaking of the mortification of evil within the heart of the

believer, and of his death unto sin. And on this the opponents of the doctrine of the resurrection dwell as one of their strongest positions. They admit that, through the circumstances under which he lived and the teaching which he had received, St. Paul speaks of the Resurrection of Jesus in much the same terms as those used by the Evangelists. But they strive to shew that, in the lessons which he derives from the Resurrection, he is constantly shaking himself loose from the historic view of that event, and putting an interpretation upon it which speaks almost solely of the elevation and purification of the souls of men while they live, and leaves out of sight that miraculous side of the story to explain away which so much diligence is at the present day expended. But if we follow the argument of the Apostle, we shall find that, though the death of the sinner unto his sins is a spiritual death, yet the death of Christ is not spoken of except as a natural one, and his resurrection as the real return of Christ from death unto life. St. Paul reasons thus. Do you not know that we who have been baptized into Jesus Christ have been baptized into his death? That is, the covenant into which we have entered has made us sharers in his death, and so the burial of our bodies is made by immersion in the waters of baptism unto death; that as through the Father's glory Christ was really raised from the dead, so we also after our death and burial and resurrection by baptism, which the Lord ordained as a means whereby we should be made one with Him, need not suffer for sin as He suffered, but may have strength through Him to walk in newness of life. For as we are planted

together with Him in the likeness of his death, so also shall we be in the likeness of his resurrection. For if we are dead with Christ (*i. e.*, if our mortification of sin through his grace be a reality) we believe that we shall also live with Him. And then he adds, as an evidence of the reality of our resurrection, the statement that Christ having been once raised dieth no more, death hath no more lordship over Him; and having conquered death in his own person, He has won life for all who truly die unto Him. But there is no figure when the Apostle comes to speak of Christ's death. He has really been among the dead (*νεκροὶ*), and has been raised (*ἐκ νεκρῶν*) from the dead. Men are to *count or reckon* themselves *νεκροὶ* while in life, if they have mortified their evil nature; but Christ's was no mere figurative dying and figurative revival, but a real and true death and a real resumption of life. In like positive terms does the Apostle in the same Epistle speak of Christ (Chap. viii. 34) as having died and come to life again. "Who is he that condemneth? Is it Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God?" And in the Epistle to the Corinthians he is even more explicit (1 Cor. xv. 3, 4), giving as not only what he taught, but what others had delivered unto him, the statement "that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again according to the scriptures," and was seen of many persons during the forty days which immediately succeeded his resurrection. We need hardly quote more. On the resurrection and ascension of Christ St. Paul taught and believed

exactly what the writers of the Gospel set forth as the statements of the earliest Christian teachers and eye-witnesses of all those scenes to which they give their testimony.

And on the subject of the judgment to come he is also in harmony with all that the Evangelists have recorded as the teaching of Christ while He was on earth. In a remarkable passage (Rom. ii. 5, *et seq.*) he speaks at length on the righteous judgment of God, and says that He "will render to every man according to his deeds in the day when he shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ." We forbear to quote the passage at length, but it is worthy of comparison with many statements of Jesus in the Gospels, and is in tone and in some of its words very close to that verse of St. Matthew (Chap. xvi. 27) in which He spake of the judgment to his disciples. "The Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels, and then he shall reward every man according to his works." And the words of this passage may well remind us how constant is that expression in the Gospels for the judgment-day, *the coming of the Son of Man.* True to this phraseology, St. Paul writes many years before the composition of the Gospels (1 Cor. i. 7), "Come behind in no gift, waiting for the *coming of our Lord Jesus Christ;*" and in the following verse, "that ye may be found blameless in the *day of our Lord Jesus Christ.*" And again (1 Cor. v. 5), "That the spirit may be saved in the *day of the Lord Jesus;*" and so (2 Cor. i. 14), "Ye also are ours in the *day of the Lord Jesus.*" And in like manner of the general nature of the judgment (Rom. xiv. 10), "We shall all stand

before the judgment seat of Christ." And with great fulness (2 Cor. v. 10), "We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." We are sure as we read words like these, relating as they do to matters which could only come to men by revelation, that the preaching of Christ, as recorded in the Gospels, had been made known at Rome and Corinth by oral teaching before such language could have been written to them by St. Paul, as testimony which they were bound to receive and in the light of which it was their duty to live. They must have heard of that discourse of Jesus on the last judgment which St. Matthew records (Chap. xxv. 31, 32): "The Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats"—a discourse the continuation of which tells of the deeds done and the deeds neglected, for which some shall go away into punishment, and others be received into life. It is needless to go further with evidence that we can find in these early Epistles of St. Paul proof enough that all which the Gospels teach us, on the subjects with which we are now dealing, was familiar to those for whom St. Paul wrote; that they had been taught the substance of our Gospel history by their first missionaries; and that, though not yet in books, the gospel was in the mouth and in the heart of all the Churches in such wise that there was no chance that when the Evangelists began to com-

mit their works to writing anything should be circulated or accepted for gospel except what was known in all the Churches as the substance of that which they had heard from the lips of those who had been with Jesus in his life.

But the Resurrection is the great miracle of the life of Jesus, and those who discredit the Gospel story, because of the miraculous element which it contains, have stumbled most of all at this, and in various modes have attempted to explain it away; not, as we have before said, to explain that the apostles did not believe it (for none have been found bold enough to say that James and Peter and Paul died for that which they did not themselves believe), but that in some sort or other they were mistaken. Now there is one feature in the way in which the Epistles speak of miracles which is in great harmony with Christ's conduct in reference to the mighty works which He wrought, as that conduct is described in the Gospels, and which if duly considered may answer some of the questions which have been raised upon the subject. We know that in our Lord's life nothing was more remarkable than the earnestness with which He, on almost all occasions, charged those for whom He had wrought any work of power to be silent about what had been done. "See thou tell no man," is the constant supplement to any miraculous act which He had performed. It is in singular accord with this feature of the Gospel history that in the Epistles which we are now considering St. Paul says little or nothing of any miracle wrought by Jesus or by himself, except the one miracle of the Resurrection. We can see from many passages the motive of Jesus:

it was a desire that men should not follow Him merely because of the miraculous evidences which his deeds shewed. When He had fed the five thousand, we read that the men who had seen that miracle followed Him, but met with rebuke, because their following was only the craving for more wonders and for the bodily sustenance which was thereby supplied, and not because they believed on Jesus. Christ did not want followers except such as were anxious to shew their love to Him by keeping his commandments. He did not wish men to be won by his works of power, but by the attraction of his love; that they should love Him because He first loved them. In singular accord with this is all that these Epistles say of miracles. St. Paul does not ignore the working, through God's Spirit, of mighty deeds for the spread of the gospel, but he refrains from dwelling upon them, as if they were not the motive power which God desired should be most operant in the hearts of men. Thus (Rom. xv. 18) he says, "I will not dare to speak of any of those things which Christ hath not wrought by me, to make the Gentiles obedient, by word and deed, through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God." Mighty signs and wonders had been wrought, the Apostle well knew; but, like his great Master, he felt that these were not the things whereby men would be most surely won to Christ. And in a like tone in the Epistle to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xii. 9, 10) he speaks of miracles as things which were done by the power of the Holy Ghost, as that "the gift of healing" was given to one man by the Spirit, and to another "the working of mir-

acles;" but we have only to read a few verses on in the Chapter, and we come to an estimate of the importance of these gifts which is not that which most men would expect. St. Paul is urgent that no man should repine over his place in the Divine economy of salvation. All cannot have the same gifts (Chap. xii. 29–31). "Are all apostles? are all prophets? are all workers of miracles? have all the gifts of healing? do all speak with tongues? do all interpret? But covet earnestly the best gifts: and yet," says he, "I shew unto you a more excellent way"—a way more excellent than all these mighty powers; and then follows the sublime Chapter on charity. This is the more excellent way. Mighty works which would remove mountains are nothing without this. So likewise in the following Chapter (xiv.), prophesying, *i.e.*, the power to preach the gospel simply and plainly, is better than the more marvellous gift of speaking with tongues, as the apostles did on the day of Pentecost. "I would," he says, "that ye all spake with tongues, but rather that ye prophesied; for greater is he that prophesieth than he that speaketh with tongues." The Apostle alludes to his own powers and gifts of this kind, but never puts them into prominence. Thus (2 Cor. xii. 12) he says, "In nothing am I behind the very chiefest of the apostles, though I be nothing. Truly the signs of an apostle were wrought among you in all patience, in signs, in wonders, and mighty deeds." He had the gift of doing wonders, but he desired, like his Master, not to be known thereby, but by the setting forth of the love of God, and the grace of Jesus Christ. We can see from these Letters that, exactly

as we read in the Acts of the Apostles, miracles were wrought by the other apostles, and that the Christian Churches had been witnesses thereof. For to the Galatians (Chap. iii. 5) St. Paul asks, as though the matter were of common fame, "He therefore that ministereth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you, doeth he it by the works of the law or by the hearing of faith?" We see then that in the Epistles, just as in the Gospels and the Acts, the working of miracles both by Christ and his apostles is recognized as an agency in the spread of the Christian faith, but yet that this manifestation of supernatural power is constantly kept in the background. It is not that on which the Christian religion most depended for its support. It is not that by which its most earnest adherents were brought to accept it. There were no miracles wrought at the calling of the apostles, if we except the draught of fishes in Simon's case; and it seems, from the ready acknowledgment of our Lord's authority, that Simon was no unwilling listener to the new Prophet even before this mighty work. This fact may give an answer to some remarks which have lately appeared, in which it has been suggested that it was from the tone of the popular mind in Christ's day that the idea of miracles became so prominent a feature in the history of early Christianity. Everybody believed in miracles, and therefore events which were not strictly miraculous were spoken of and accepted as such by reason of the popular credulity. And we are asked to believe that St. Paul was only led by the current of the thoughts of all men in his time to believe in the historical character of the Re-

surrection, and that his keen mind has after all put the right construction upon the teaching of the resurrection of Christ, when he writes (2 Cor. v. 15, *et seq.*), "If one died for all, then all died: and he died for all, that those who live should henceforth no longer live for themselves, but for him who died and rose again." From this passage we are expected to draw the conclusion that St. Paul did not press as most important the truth of the resurrection of Christ's body, but dwelt most upon the spiritual raising of the souls of living men. And as a "psychological parallel"[1] to this mistaken belief of St. Paul, we are invited to contemplate the case of the good judge, Sir Matthew Hale, who, in a time when a belief in witchcraft was widely prevalent, was a sharer in the popular error, and condemned to death two old women, on the evidence given by a couple of rickety and hysterical children, who declared that they were bewitched, and that these unfortunate women were the cause thereof. But the writer of the article to which we allude has not balanced the two cases very carefully. St. Paul may have been a man of no higher character and no greater acumen than Sir Matthew Hale, but St. Paul had at one time of his life been suddenly struck blind, and had continued blind for three days. And concerning the occasion when he was thus deprived of sight, he testifies over and over again that Jesus appeared to him and spake to him, and thus gave him assurance of the fact that He was alive again; and this became so prominently the teaching of St. Paul, that when he was in the hands of Festus it was

[1] See an article with this title in the "Contemporary Review," Nov. 1876.

the only point on which the heathen magistrate could speak positively to Agrippa. The accusation brought against Paul shaped itself in the main into a question about "one Jesus who was dead, whom Paul affirmed to be alive." Here is no case of a man led by the popular voice, but by a voice which he himself declared that he had heard from Heaven; and it is not *with* but *against* the credence of the multitude that he affirms Jesus to be alive. Then in the matter of the evidence external to the Apostle, can the diseased fancies of two children, such as are described in the article before us, be compared to that list of testimony which St. Paul quotes in the beginning of that famous Chapter (1 Cor. xv.) in which he treats at full on this solemn subject? Hearken to the catalogue. "He was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve: after that, he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once; of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep. After that, he was seen of James; then of all the apostles. And last of all he was seen of me also." Can these fairly be called only a parallel to such witnesses as were brought forward in this trial of witches at Lowestoft? Can the testimony of men, who were ready to die, and many of whom did die, for the verity of that resurrection of which their own eyes had been witnesses, be for a moment set beside such second- or third-hand statements and hypotheses as are laid before us in the accusation of these Lowestoft witches? Peter and the twelve who had known Christ for years! Five hundred brethren, who were many of them alive to contradict the Apostle's statement had it been unfounded! Nor was the belief in the resur-

rection of the dead at all the popular turn, as is represented in this article. Herod it is true spoke of John as having come to life again, but the Sadducees were a large section of the Jewish community, and they discarded utterly the belief in a rising again from the dead. We are told also (Mark ix. 10) that the disciples of Jesus had no comprehension of such a belief. When Jesus after the Transfiguration had charged them that they should tell no man what things they had seen till the Son of Man were risen from the dead, we read: "They kept that saying with themselves, questioning one with another what the rising from the dead should mean." So, too, over that discourse recorded by St. John (Chap. xvi.), in which the Lord spake to the twelve of his departure, and repeatedly said to them, "A little while, and ye shall not see me: and again a little while, and ye shall see me;" and explained these words in some degree by adding, "Ye shall weep and lament, but the world shall rejoice: and ye shall be sorrowful, but your sorrow shall be turned into joy"—we find the same wonder expressed by them, a wonder which would hardly have come upon them had they been possessed with the idea of a resurrection from the dead. They said among themselves, "What is this that he saith unto us, . . . a little while? We cannot tell what he saith." And that the resurrection from the dead was not a part of the popular creed in the way which is here presumed, may be seen from the question of St. Paul when he pleads before Agrippa (Acts xxvi. 8), "Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead?" The parallel which has

been instituted is therefore one which cannot hold. Neither the principal actors, nor the witnesses, nor the tone of popular thought, are alike; and nothing can be clearer than that St. Paul believed in the truth of the resurrection of Jesus against the popular opinion, and that he had evidence which was of the highest value, and, beside this, had a personal conviction from a manifestation made to himself, which removes his belief in the Resurrection into a very different sphere from the credence which even an upright judge in the time of the Stuarts may be seen to have given to witchcraft.

Thus have we, following as nearly as possible the order of the Apostles' Creed, traced the Gospel history which is to be found in four of St. Paul's Epistles. It may be well in another article to adopt the historic method, and set down in the order in which they are found in the Evangelists all the facts which we have been able to discover in the Letters. Thus the reader will be made conscious how much of the Gospel story we should still possess even if we had not a single Gospel. *Sed hæc hactenus.*

J. RAWSON LUMBY.

ANOTHER NEW BIBLE.

WHILE the Committees have been meeting at Westminster, to revise the Authorized Version of the Holy Bible, smaller companies of scholars, more or less self-appointed, have taken the same work in hand; and, as smaller bodies are apt to move more rapidly than larger ones, are already giving us the results of their labours. It is but a few months since Mr.

Sanday reviewed in the pages of this Magazine, with much deserved commendation, the New Bible produced by the united labours of Messrs. Cheyne, Driver, Clarke, and Goodwin; and now already another Bible[1] is before us, which we owe to the conjoint toils of Dr. S. G. Green and Dr. Jacob on the New Testament, and of Dr. Gotch and the late Dr. Benjamin Davies on the Old Testament — the two last-named gentlemen ranking high among the most eminent Hebraists of the present generation; while the whole volume has had the benefit of the general supervision of Mr. Joseph Gurney, who has devoted many years to the work of translation and revision.

The distinctive feature of the former of these Bibles is that, while it accepts the Authorized Version as its text, underneath the text there flow two series of notes, in the one of which the various *readings* of the Original Manuscripts are recorded, and in the other the various *renderings* of difficult or disputed passages suggested by the ablest critics and commentators of every school. In the latter, these variations both of reading and rendering, in so far as they are approved, are introduced into the text itself, instead of being relegated to foot-notes—a feature which, while it greatly adds to the responsibility of the editor and revisers, relieves the reader of much labour and trouble. In short, while in the earlier published work we have an edition of the Authorized Version of the Bible enriched by a double series of valuable annotations, in this later volume we have a new translation of an amended text—in fact, a new Version—of the Bible.

[1] Revised English Bible. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode.

Nor is this the only distinctive feature of what, for brevity's sake, we may call Mr. Gurney's Bible. Among others, I may mention these. (1) The whole contents of the Bible have been re-arranged in sections and paragraphs, so as to bring out the main flow and connections of thought, hidden at times by the arbitrary and often injudicious divisions into Chapter and Verse. (2) The poetical books of Scripture, and portions of books, are printed as poetry—an arrangement which of itself serves to enhance the force and beauty of many of the noblest passages of Holy Writ. (3) In this New Translation special attention has been given to the grammar of the Bible, to the exact force of tenses, articles, prepositions, and those connecting particles, or particles of logical transition, on which the course and cogency of an argument greatly depend; and, moreover, where the niceties of grammar and logic demand a change, it is claimed for the revisers that they have studied to preserve the fine English idiom, the charm of style, which characterizes our Authorized Version. And (4) a few good and useful maps are appended to the volume.

After a careful examination, I have pleasure in reporting that, on the whole, with one partial exception perhaps, the laws and aims which governed this new revision of the Bible have been thoroughly well carried out, so well carried out that every student of the Bible will gather valuable help from it. The grammatical niceties of the Original *are* far more closely followed than in the Authorized Version. The rendering is much more exact; and at times a new complexion is given to passages of the gravest

moment by a stricter adherence to the Hebrew or Greek : as, for instance, in St. John iii. 16–19, where by substituting the verb "to judge" for the verb "to condemn" a new and more Christian sense is given to the passage, and its connection with the whole discourse of our Lord is more clearly brought out. The re-arrangement of the contents of the Bible in sections and paragraphs is eminently thoughtful and judicious, and constantly enables the reader to avoid the obscurities created by the Chapter-and-Verse divisions: *e. g.*, that most maladroit separation of the last verse of St. Matthew xix. from the first sixteen verses of Chapter xx. And, chief point of all, the emendations introduced into the text of Scripture are made in a reverent and conservative spirit. Many readings and renderings which carry a great weight of authority, and some that I myself should gladly have seen adopted, appear only in the margin. For the most part, at least, it is only indisputably erroneous readings and confessedly inadequate renderings which are corrected in the text of this Translation. No one need fear to find in it many, or large, or dubious, or violent, changes. For scholars and students the Bible of Mr. Cheyne and his associates is still the better book; but the myriads of intelligent and devout readers of the Word to whom the mysteries of MSS. Versions, Authorities, &c., are unknown, and the labour of consulting and weighing foot-notes and interpreting abbreviations is formidable and unwelcome, will do wisely to possess themselves of Mr. Gurney's revision. They will find much help in it, and learn much from it that they need to know.

The point on which I think the success of the revisers most doubtful is in their endeavour to preserve the fine idiom, the charm of style, which endears the Authorized Version to all English-speaking men. It is true that, as a rule, they retain its words and idioms; but where they depart from it—as now and then they do necessarily, and now and then quite unnecessarily—their renderings are not always of the happiest. For example, the closing phrase of 1 Kings xviii. 29 runs in our Authorized Version, "*There was neither voice, nor any to answer, nor any that regarded.*" What is gained, even in accuracy, for substituting for this fine, familiar, and musical phrase, such a rendering as, "*There was no voice, nor answerer, nor attention*"? What is lost is only too obvious. So, again, the coarse Hebrew idiom employed in 1 Samuel xxv. 22, and elsewhere, and retained in our Authorized Version in its bluntest form, so that it becomes almost impossible to read in public several of the finest Chapters in the Historical Books of the Old Testament, must of necessity be altered in any new Version. But though the sense be given accurately enough in the new rendering, "*If I leave till the morning light one male,*" is not that a somewhat poor and bald idiom? The words do not fall finely and satisfactorily on the ear. Even so slight an alteration as, "If I leave till the morning light *a single male;*" or, better still, the mere transposition, "*If I leave one male till the morning light,*" would, I think, be an easy and obvious improvement.

Nor are the other leading aims of this Version invariably, though they are commonly, quite reached.

Thus, though Balaam's predictions, and the dying strains of Moses and Jacob, and even the song of Lamech, are printed in a poetic form, the indubitable little song of Sarah, recorded in Genesis xxi. 7—

> Who would have said to Abraham,
> Sarah gives baby the breast?
> For I have borne him a son in his old age!—

is printed simply as prose; and thus a fact of some interest, viz., that Sarah "the princess" was also a poetess, is veiled from the general reader.

So, too, though "special attention has been devoted" to "giving their exact force to the different tenses of verbs," and though for the most part their force is well brought out, yet now and then it is missed: as, for instance, in the rendering of the two tiny but charming parables given in James i., in *Verse* 11 and in *Verses* 23–25. In the Original the historic tenses throw these parables or illustrations into the past, make tales or anecdotes of them, and shew that St. James had in his eye a particular man whom he had seen gazing into his mirror, and a particular flower, which he had gathered, probably, from the field of prophecy (Isaiah xl. 6). And yet, in this new Version the present tenses of the Authorized Version are retained.

Did space permit, many other slight improvements might be suggested. But no such work as this can hope to reach perfection in its first edition. In future editions no doubt all necessary emendations will be made; and, mean time, I cordially commend it to all who love and study the Word of God.

EDITOR.

THE DESCENT INTO EGYPT.

ST. MATTHEW ii. 13–15.

THE explanation usually given of this event in our Lord's childhood is that it was a device necessary to preserve the Infant's life, intended, as regards its form, to fulfil an Old Testament prophecy. And with this explanation the whole significance of the incident is supposed to be exhausted. Negative critics, somewhat naively accepting as complete this statement of its place and purpose in the career of Jesus, find no difficulty in excising as a mythical excrescence an event in itself so improbable, and connected by such a slender and isolated attachment to the main body of the life. But if it can be shewn that the flight into Egypt was no mere expedient of rescue, but is, on the contrary, a moulding factor of continuous influence in Christ's life, giving to the subsequent stream of his fortunes a quite novel character and direction, then we shall have rendered the short and easy method of excision a much more difficult operation, while what was a point of defensive weakness will be turned into a position of offensive strength. For it is certain that every new exhibition of organic and teleological continuity in the narratives of the Gospels (regarded merely as narratives) renders more and more untenable that theory which represents our Gospel record as an agglomeration of

myths sporadically produced in time and space, and randomly crystallized upon a slender thread of actual history. An adequate exposition is commonly the best apologetic.

The Divine purpose of our Lord's incarnation required that during his days on earth He should share the experience of ordinary human life. It was therefore essential that He should not be recognized and treated as superhuman. The prince who will really become acquainted with the slights poverty endures must do so *incognito*. And his *incognito* must not be a public secret, but an impenetrable and unsuspected disguise. Therefore it is that, in the Old Testament, the prophetic foreshadowings of the Messiah's intrinsic grandeur are so obscure and imperfect. Therefore it is that all through his ministry He veiled his glory, habitually calling Himself, not the Son of God, but the Son of Man. Had He perpetually flashed the brightness of his glory in men's eyes, it would have been impossible for the Divine Will to be executed, that by wicked hands the Lord of Glory should be crucified and slain. Had not his inner grandeur been so carefully shrouded that, not only the people, but also his friends and disciples, so far from treating Him as a superhuman being, habitually regarded Him as a man like themselves, that other Divine purpose had been frustrated which decreed that He should be in all points tried like as we are; a decree that secured for Him that normal human experience which, acquired on earth, has been carried to heaven, and through the memory of which He can still be touched with the feeling of our infirmities.

This principle in the providential ordering of the circumstances of our Lord's life seems to furnish the clue to a right understanding of the place and purpose of the Descent into Egypt. For, as a matter of fact, the Egyptian exile had a quite paramount influence in procuring for Jesus the social and moral environment indispensable for the acquisition of such an experience. So far from being determined by Herod's deadly designs, and having its powers exhausted in the rescue of the Holy Child, the tyrant's hate was only its occasion, while its real purpose was to exert a decisive and abiding effect on the immediate and future setting of the Saviour's earthly career, so fashioning it as to accomplish the Divine design. Thus, instead of being a detail of subsidiary interest, it is practically the most important occurrence in the Infancy; and our estimate of it must be shaped accordingly. We must consider it, not as a temporary expedient whose value is spent in obviating a threatened danger, but as a fountain-head of far-reaching influence—a momentous fact whose *raison d'être* is to be sought, not in its evanescent occasion, but in its prospective action. We are dealing, not with an effect, but with a cause, having its face not turned to the past but directed to the future. It is not a simple episode, but a crisis and a turning-point, in our Lord's career.

That it *is* a real crisis, and not merely an episode, a glance at the history reveals. For it makes a clear break and division in the life, so that the parts on either side are distinct and dissimilar. The stream is indeed deflected, and placed on quite another plane of movement. Up to this point his advent in the

world had been signalized by startling portents, by miraculous annunciations, by angelic carols, by mysterious stars. Shepherds hasten to worship at his cradle, wise men come to wonder and adore, venerable seers and saintly women greet Him with prophetic ecstasy and holy gladness; so that even Jerusalem began to be stirred with awe and expectation. Suddenly, from all this atmosphere of marvel and adoration, with strange contrast of terror and helplessness, the Infant is snatched away in hurried midnight flight to Egypt; whence, after a period of concealment, He is brought back, not to Bethlehem, where his fame still lingered, but to secluded Nazareth, where the wonder of his birth was quite unknown. And now, in this new plane and section of his life, no portents declare his exalted character, no adoring crowds kneel before Him. Quietly He grows up in a humble home, treated as an ordinary child by his parents, by his companions, and by the whole circle of his neighbours, who do not even suspect his miraculous advent, nor know the high prophecies that heralded his ministry.

What were the reasons for this abrupt and remarkable transition? I think they are these. It was meet that his birth should be marked by marvels; needful that the parents' faith in their Child's grand destiny should be aroused by prophecy, miracle, and adoration; good, too, that in Bethlehem and Jerusalem expectation should be awakened, and the hearts of waiting saints comforted. But it was meet, also, and imperative, that after a certain point all this should cease; for, otherwise, the Divine plan of his life could not have been carried out. Had no Herod's jealous

fear put an end to the glory and acclamation, had portents continued to force men, by an overawing blaze of splendour, to recognize the Infant King, how different would have been his career! Forced into such premature publicity, accepted as the Christ on such unsatisfactory grounds, claimed by men whose Messianic hopes were earthly and ambitious, He could never have known the simple life of a lowly human child, the tenderness of a mother's love, the trials and temptations, the thoughts, hopes, and fears of ordinary boyhood, youth, and manhood. He could not have acquired that natural human experience and discipline which He came to acquire. He might have been the great Messianic King, adored by his countrymen, but not the Man of Sorrows, acquainted with grief. He could not have lived his life of humiliation, nor died his atoning death of shame.

It was indispensable, therefore, that the career of the miraculous Child should be transferred from the plane of marvel and publicity in which it was moving to the secluded and obscure level on which the children of men obtain their earlier training and experience. It was necessary that He should be withdrawn from the notoriety which was already becoming dangerous, and placed in retirement, where He would be unrecognized, and secure alike from intrusive adulation and impatient expectancy. But this change of environment could not possibly be accomplished at Bethlehem. Nor, indeed, as regards the parents, could it be secured without a seeming reversal of their hopes. How then could the task of extricating the Child, and diverting the

stream of his fortunes into the new channel, have been better accomplished than by the sudden forced departure in ignominious flight from Bethlehem, the compulsory concealment for a considerable period in Egypt, and the subsequent return to the quiet and seclusion of Nazareth? It was a sort of catastrophe which, as nothing less could have done, carried his life into a new atmosphere, making a great and definitive break in the course of events, rescuing his youth from the eager but misguided enthusiasm of the people, constraining his very parents to reticence till the time for manifesting Himself had come, and procuring for Him the possibility of a normal experience of human existence.

As an instance of the wide and far-reaching effects of this occurrence of our Lord's infancy in determining the subsequent external mould and setting wherein his experiences were formed, consider the powerful and continuous influence it must have had in fashioning the attitude of Mary and Joseph towards the wondrous Child of promise. Besides the very practical lesson on the prudence of keeping to themselves the marvellous escort of wonder and hope with which He had been ushered into the world, this abrupt and harsh vicissitude of fortune must have had a large and potent effect on their personal dispositions, and on their relation to their Charge. Possessed as they then were with worldly and unspiritual notions of the Messianic King, had not the splendour of the dawn been quickly dashed with storm and gloom, they might have cherished in their hearts thoughts of ambition, selfish dreams, and arrogant hopes, which would have made a discord in

the music of that holy childhood, and, intruding prematurely and mistakenly, would have distorted the fair development of its unsullied innocence. Sharing as they did the false ideas prevalent of the Messiah's mission, they could not safely be trusted with the certitude of his dignity, for their ignorant faith would have urged them into misguided and disastrous action. Because of this immaturity, it was requisite that their hope should be deferred, their confidence shaken, their expectation perplexed, so as to restrain them from hurtful meddling and untimely prompting. It was, in plain words, necessary to shake their exultant but unchastened faith sufficiently to restrain them from venturing any act upon their own responsibility, and to make them content to ponder the past wonders in the secrecy of their hearts, leaving the Child, undisturbed by any premature disclosures, to receive in the slow process of his Father's own teaching the undistorted disclosure of the work He had to do. How effectual on his human parents this education by adversity was, we see from the fact that Jesus was treated in his home, not as a supernatural Infant, but simply as a child, which would have been impossible had marvel and worship continued to attend Him. Moreover, while the flight from Herod, with its seeming eclipse of the dawning promise of glory, served to crush their undue anticipations, it must also, with its foreshadowing of a future not all prosperous, have prepared their hearts for that later revelation of the true destiny of Him whose earthly throne was to be the cross, and his crown a crown of thorns. The mother's sharp pang of terror for her son's life was

the first presaging thrust of the sword that was to pierce through Mary's heart. And the chill gloom of that fear-haunted night was the earliest falling of that shadow of the cross which hovered, like a soul of care, even in the brightest sunshine of that fair life. The chastening memory of proud dreams rudely broken by that midnight agony of dread, and the patient resignation of lowly submission learned during the Egyptian exile, cannot but have contributed in many ways to make the relation of the parents to their sacred Charge more reverent and true and solemn.

Striking confirmation of the justness of this conception of the real purpose served by the Descent into Egypt is furnished by the allusion to Old Testament history which the Evangelist makes when he ends his narrative with the words, "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, Out of Egypt have I called my son!" We say allusion to Old Testament history, because it is not fair to assume from this passing reference, made with the customary citation-formula of the period, that the writer supposed the words to be a direct prediction of Christ, which they certainly are not.[1] The prophet is expressly speaking of Israel; and what the Evangelist means by the quotation, is to call attention to the fact that the nation's sojourn in Egypt, with the subsequent restoration, is

[1] It seems hardly necessary to call attention to the impropriety of reading the quotation-formula as if it implied that the Egyptian banishment was brought about by Providence in order to fulfil the prophecy. Even were this a direct prediction, surely it were more natural to say that the occurrence was foretold because it was to happen, than that the event happened because it was foretold; that prophecy conformed itself to the future history, rather than that the history was determined by an arbitrarily-framed prophetic programme.

prophetic of what befell the Infant Jesus. For the one event is typical of the other, in the sense that from the first the second might be expected, since the unchangeableness of the Divine Will, working straight on toward a set purpose on fixed principles that determine uniformity of action, may be counted on in like situations to produce like *dénouements*. This being the foundation of the prophetic power of types, we shall feel the full foreshadowing force of the present instance only when the closeness of the analogy between the two events is appreciated; and that is much greater than is commonly supposed. Naturally enough, the Evangelist emphasizes only the matter-of-fact resemblance in the identity of Egyptian banishment and Divine restoration. But besides this external similarity, with our clue we shall discover also identity of inner motive and underlying design.

The household of Jacob had to leave the Promised Land and descend into Egypt, because their lives were imperilled by a famine, just as had the Infant Jesus, his life being menaced by Herod's hate. But as in the latter case the true purpose was to secure for the Redeemer the kind of life essential for the performance of his work, so, in the other, the grand object accomplished was to remove the Redemption People from a position which would have been fatal to their Divine destiny, and to place them in an environment that would secure their normal and necessary development. For we find that the treasure of the monotheistic and redemptive religion confided to the house of Jacob, depending as it did for its safety on their national separateness, was

in imminent hazard from intermarriage with the nomad families of Canaan, who—shepherds like themselves—were ready enough to form such alliances. Therefore it was that, on occasion of the famine, they were transferred to Egypt, where their national isolation was ensured, since, as we read, "every shepherd is an abomination unto the Egyptians." And not till Egypt had served its end, and through the exile God had hindered his great purpose from being frustrated, did He triumphantly bring his people back to the Land of Promise. Now, inasmuch as the Almighty will unchangeably execute his redemptive decree, the Divine action in this event was typical and prophetic of what would be done in a similar emergency. Thus, in a very profound and wide sense, the Old Testament story was a foreshadowing of the New Testament event; while the accuracy of our understanding of the purpose of the latter is confirmed by the identity of motive in the former.

It is of course true that the applicability of such prophetic reference in the type to subsequent events could not be perceived beforehand save as a general expectation, and it may therefore be urged that it is valueless. As no doubt it is, if the sole worth of the prophetic aspect of the Divine Revelation be the pleasurable surprise afforded superstitious minds by the discovery of remarkable coincidences between prediction and fulfilment. But if the real value and purpose of the Divine manifestation be to guide, comfort, and strengthen men's souls, then surely two of its most precious powers are the reassuring foreknowledge of God's fidelity to his promises, and the

consequent sense of security for the future because of God's dealings in the past—both of which have their origin in the conviction of this universal prophetic character, as apart from particular predictions, of the Divine Revelation. It may well be that, for the most part, the plenitude of meaning and foreshadowing significance reveal themselves only, long after the fulfilment, to a profounder and better instructed insight. But who can tell how often the general typical import and teaching of, for instance, this same Egyptian Exile, has comforted and braced the hearts of good men in times of national captivity, reassuring them amid seeming defeat of final triumph? And when to Simeon, Anna, and the pious souls of Bethlehem, left by the Child's sudden flight disconsolate, news came that He was safe in Egypt, and, though in exile, still alive, is it so certain that none of them, struck by the resemblance, remembered amid their grief and fears how once before the people, on whose fortunes then hung the world's hope of redemption, pining in Egyptian bondage far from the Land of Promise, had seemed to be cast off by God for ever? And then, as the ancient story rose before their minds, and they recalled how the darkness had been rolled away, and out of seeming misfortune only good had come, their courage would revive, and hope return that once again, as in olden times, God would bring his Son out of Egypt, and triumphantly accomplish his purpose of mercy.

W. G. ELMSLIE.

CHRISTIANS IN THE TALMUD.

In estimating the Jewish writings as a whole, we must never forget that, after the triumph of Christianity, the Jews were not only hated with all the hatred which the Pagan and Gentile world had always entertained towards their race, but were regarded with very special abhorrence as the descendants and the admiring representatives of those who had crucified their Lord. In all the relations between the Chosen People and the outer world, we see the ruinous results of mutual uncharity. The Mosaic law, while it not unnaturally insisted most on the need of mutual kindnesses between the members of the peculiar race, had yet clearly indicated the duty of the Hebrew towards the stranger. But the pride of nationality, the arrogance of Pharisaism, the exclusiveness of privilege, the selfishness of human nature, had perverted all such humanitarian principles, until it was no calumny against the Jewish Rabbis to say that they had deliberately taught the atrocious doctrine of loving their neighbours, but hating their enemies.[1] And this, as it was the solemn charge brought against the spirit of Rabbinic teaching by Jesus, was the universal belief of the ancient world as regards the conduct and principles of the Jews, whom they charged with cherishing a detestation against all people except themselves,[2] and of whom they believed it to be a fundamental law—

---

[1] Matt. v. 43, "Do not shew any kindness or pity to the Gentiles." Midr. Tehillîn, p. 26. 4 ap. Schöttgen, *Hor. Hebr. ad. loc.* "The Mishna is full of such passages." Gfrörer, Jahr. d. Heils. i. 114.

[2] "Adversus omnes alios hostile odium." Tac. H. v. 5.

Non monstrare vias eadem nisi sacra colenti,
Quaesitum ad fontem solos deducere verpos.[1]

Thus, in all ages, do hatred and uncharity reproduce their kind. Christianity, indeed, ought to have inspired the hearts of its children with nobler and better lessons; and had it done so there can be little doubt that it would have triumphed over Judaism as it triumphed over Paganism, not with the dominance of an unsparing tyranny, but by the supremacy of a loftier ideal and more holy lives. Had we in general been inspired with the same love towards the Jew which breathed so passionately in the heart of Paul, as to make him even willing to be anathema from Christ for the sake of his brethren according to the flesh,[2] can we doubt that myriads of the Israelites would have been unable to withstand the spell which Jesus has in all ages exercised over the hearts of men of every race and creed?

Thou! if Thou wast He, who at midwatch came
By the starlight, naming a dubious name!
And if too heavy with sleep, too rash
With fear—O Thou, if that martyr-gash
Fell on Thee, coming to take Thine own,
And we gave the Cross, when we owed the Throne,
Thou art the Judge. We are bruiséd thus;
But, the judgment over, join sides with us!
Thine, too, is the cause, and not more Thine
Than ours, is the work of these dogs and swine,
Whose life laughs through and spits at their creed;
Who maintain Thee in word, and defy Thee in deed.

So spake "Rabbi Ben Ezra the night he died;" and in the sins and violences of Christians we see the reasons why the Jew, even amid times of his dawn-

[1] Juv. *Sat.* xiv. 103; Justin, xxxvi. 2, 15. *παραδόσιμον ποιῆσαι, τὸ μῖσος το πρὸς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους.* Diod. *Exc. Phot.* xxxiv. p. 424; Hor. *Sat.* i. 4, 142, &c.

[2] Rom. ix. 3.

ing convictions, was driven to furious antagonism against his rejected Messiah.

> By the torture prolong'd from age to age,
> By the infamy, Israel's heritage;
> By the Ghetto's plague, by the garb's disgrace,
> By the badge of shame, by the felon's place;
> By the branding tool, the bloody whip,
> And the summons to Christian fellowship!

But alas! owing to man's weaknesses and imperfections, Churches, like other communities, suffering in all centuries from the centrifugal force of internal disunion, have sought to supply the needed centripetal force by the manifold repulsions of their common hatreds against all who were beyond their pale. Toleration was one of the earliest lessons taught by Christ, but it has been historically the latest of all lessons learnt by those who call themselves by his sacred name.

I do not for a moment say that the hatred of the Christian towards the Jew was not evoked and exasperated by an equal intensity of hatred felt by the Jew towards the Christian. We see that hatred in the very first century burning with red flame, alike in the pages of secular histories and in the Acts of the Apostles. The anger and madness which fired "the serpent brood of Hanan" against the earliest preachers of the truth[1] that *He* had risen whom they by wicked hands had crucified and slain, became more and more intense as time advanced. Every circumstance which failed to convince the Jews of the Divine origin of the new religion only inspired a more virulent rage against it. St. Paul paid with his very life for the bitter wrath which he

[1] Acts v. 28.

had inspired by deserting the glorious position of a learned Rabbi, and emissary of the High Priest and the Sanhedrin, for the lot of a persecuted missionary who threw open to the Gentiles the hitherto barred door of religious privilege. The conflagration of Rome, in all probability, gave the Jews an opportunity of diverting from themselves the false suspicion of guilt, by turning suspicion against the Christians, and so avenging on them the edict of Claudius, which in consequence of Messianic disturbances had caused their banishment from Rome.[1] The escape of the Christians to Pella, before the fall of Jerusalem, would be regarded as the act of open renegades, who refused to take part in the supreme struggle of the Hebrew people for its very existence. For those who were trained from earliest childhood to see the hand of God in history, it might have been thought that the destruction of their Temple, and the total desolation of their Holy City, involving as it did the necessary extinction of Mosaism as a possible religion, would at last have opened the eyes of the Jews to the desperateness of a position which God Himself had rendered no longer tenable; and even the dullest eyes, unless they were filmed by centuries of prejudice, might have seen that the scroll of the Old Covenant was shrivelled into ashes by the flame which devoured the cedar wood, and melted the gold, of the Holy of Holies. But the cogency of the lesson was lost in the frenzy which it inspired; and when for one moment, in the successes of Bar Cochba, and the glory of Akibha, and the prosperity of Bethyr, the hopes of Judaism

[1] Acts xviii. 2.

seemed to revive once more, it was on the Christians that the arm of the victorious Mesîth fell with most implacable wrath. So that even from the earliest times, and long before concealment of their written sentiments was rendered necessary by fear, the Jews, in their treatises, spoke of the Christians under every possible term of opprobrium. "Christians" they never called them. That name—a convenient hybrid which affixed a Latin termination to the Greek rendering of a Hebrew conception—though invented by the scornful wit of the Antiochenes,—who were celebrated in antiquity for their skill in inventing nicknames,—had been very early adopted by the believers in Christ. It is true that in the New Testament they are spoken of as the "saints," or "the brethren," and that the word Christian only occurs in the Epistle of St. Peter, and on the lips of Agrippa, as the term for a legally indictable offence;[1] but, very shortly after the close of the New Testament canon, the name had been universally adopted alike by friend and foe; and as the mobs of Pagan cities rejoiced in the sonorous epitrites of their favourite cry of

Chrĭsti ānōs
Ād lĕōnēs!

so, before the fiercest tribunals, the youngest martyr exulted in the answer, *Christianus sum!* But the Jews had two reasons against sanctioning the use of this name. In the first place, they would not seem in the most distant way to countenance any connection between the work of Jesus and their own expected Messiah. In the second place, they chose

[1] Except in the historic notice of its origin (Acts xi. 26), the name Christian —as everybody is aware—occurs only in Acts xxvi. 28 and 1 Pet. iv. 16.

to regard the Christians as idolaters, and therefore adopted in their case the practice which they had founded on a literal misinterpretation of the Verse in Deûteronomy which forbade them to take the name of any strange god upon their lips. The same delight in opprobrious nicknames which made them twist Beelzebul, the Lord of Heaven, into *Beelzebub*, the Lord of Dung; or Kir Heres, the City of the Sun, into *Kir Cheres*, the City of Destruction; or Bethel, the House of God—after its desecration by the calf-worship—into *Beth-aven*, "the House of Vanity," made them invent terms of insult both for the Christians and for Christ. Moses had said, "Ye shall hew down the graven images of their gods, *and destroy the names of them out of that place;*"[1] and the Talmudic comment upon this was—Everything that is made for the sake of false gods must bear a nickname. We must not say Beth Galia, "lofty house," but *Beth Charia*, "common house;" not Penî Melech, "face of a king" (Moloch), but *Penî Kelef*, "face of a hound;"[2] not Epiphanes, "the illustrious," but *Epimanes*, "the maniac." It was on this principle that they spoke not of Tadmor, but of *Tarmod*, or "chaff;" not of Romans, but of *Idumæans*. It was natural, therefore, that they should never use the word Christians, but speak of "Galileans," "Nazarenes," "Children of Balaam," "Worshippers of the Hung," "Epicureans," "Sadducees," and, normally, of Minîm or Heretics.[3] We must not, indeed, charge them with either inventing or monopolizing this method. It was known

[1] Deut. xii. 3. [2] Temura, 28 b.; En Israel, ii. 145 d.
[3] A "Min" usually means a Christian.

both to Greeks and Romans and English, both to Jews and Christians and Mussulmans. Aristophanes, as every scholar knows, abounds in instances. Chrysippus, the great Stoic, was called by his enemies, Chesippus. Tiberius Claudius Nero received, from his bibulous propensities, the nickname of Biberius Caldius Mero.[1] We find traces of the same thing among the Fathers. Cyprianus was distorted into Coprianus; Athanasius into Sathanasius; Vigilantius into Dormitantius; the Arians into Ariomanites;[2] Abelard into Bajolard; Otho of Brunswick called Pope Urban VI. Turbanus, from his turbulence; and Queen Elizabeth addressed Bodin as Badin. The Mohammedans, instead of calling the Parsees "fire-worshippers" (Kaliva), call them *Philiva*, "fools." And as the Jews, when delivered from the illusion of Bar Cochba, "the son of a star," changed his name into *Bar Cozba*, "the son of a lie," so R. Meir turns the word Evangelium into the similar-sounding Hebrew words, און גיליון, "table of lies;" and R. Johanan into עון גיליון, "table of sins."

But we have not nearly exhausted the terms of hatred bestowed by the Jew, more or less openly or obliquely, on the Christian. Thus, as the Mohammedans are called "sons of Ishmael," the Christians are alluded to as *sons of Esau*. "God, who has smitten the Egyptians with one of his fingers," said R. Eliezer, "will extirpate the sons of Esau (Christians) and the sons of Ishmael (Mohammedans) with his whole law; for the first are the enemies of his people, and the second his own enemies."[3]

[1] From *bibo*, "I drink;" *calda*, "hot water;" *merum*, "unmixed wine."
[2] See my "Chapters on Language," p. 246. [3] Pirke Eliezer, 48.

They are also called *Sadducecs*, and it is said that if a Jew is chased by a murderer, or a serpent, it is better for him to fly into a temple of idolaters than of Sadducees, because the former deny God without knowing Him, whereas the latter deny God whom they know. The object of such allusion was not only hatred, but concealment, and we may conjecture that the Christians are often really in the thoughts of the Talmudists when they are using neutral terms, such as *Ger* (proselyte), and *Nosrî* (stranger), and *Goyîm* (heathen). Thus in unabridged passages of the Talmud it is said that "the pious of Israel do not fast on the first day of the week, because of the *Goyîm*," and this evidently means "the Christians," since, in Taanîth (27, 2), we find the oblique expression of hatred, "Because it is the holy day *of those people*."[1] That the Christians are alluded to under the bitter appellation of *Benî Edom* and *Benî Esau* is clear, both because it is expressly stated,[2] and because Rabbis Kimchi and Bechai, writing about Isaiah lxvi. 17, say that *the Edomites* are accustomed to move their fingers in two directions (*i.e.*, *make the sign of the cross*), and have warp and woof (*i.e.*, the cross); and they use interchangeably the expressions, "these are Edomites" and "these are Notzerîm" (Nazarenes, Christians).[3] The reason for these appellations is partly to express that the innate detestation of Jews to Christians is as strong as that which reigned between Esau and Jacob; and partly because it is one of their sad blasphemies that the soul of Esau passed by metempsychosis into the

[1] יום טוב שלהם הוא. Chiarini, ii. 308.

[2] See Ibid. ii. 306.

[3] Buxtorf, *Lex. Thal.* s. v. אדום.

body of Christ. This is indeed expressly asserted by Abarbanel in the Mashmia Yeschona (nature of salvation), f. 19, 4, and in his "Commentary on Isaiah."[1] "Wise theologians have learnt by tradition that the soul of Esau has passed into Jeshu ha Notzeri" (Jesus the Nazarene).

Other names by which those who abandoned Judaism in general, and the Christians in particular, are designated, are "philosophers" and "Epicureans."[2] The latter name not only inflicted the stigma of Gentile indifference on the name of Christian, but connoted looseness of character. In the dialect of the Talmud, *Phakar* meant "to presume," and some of its derivatives were used to express impurity of life.[3]

One or two of the anecdotes relating encounters between Christians and Rabbis may be interesting to our readers.

1. On one occasion "a philosopher," *i.e.*, a Christian, asked Rabban Gamaliel whether he could prove that God would one day deliver the Jews. "Undoubtedly," answered Gamaliel. "And yet," said the philosopher, "we read in Hosea v. 6, 'God hath withdrawn himself from them,' like a brother who refuses to marry his brother's widow in accordance with the levirate law of Deuteronomy xxv., and when a brother has once done that, he cannot change his mind. God therefore will never return to you." The answer of Gamaliel is a mere verbal quibble on the word "withdraw." "In the levirate marriage," he replied, "it is *the widow* who *draws*

[1] F. 54. 1, 3, 4. [2] Abhoda Zara, iii. 4; Derenbourg, "Palestine," p. 356.

[3] See Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.* s. v. פָּקַר. Hence the Jewish name for *lupanar* was *Hephker*.

the shoe from the foot of her brother-in-law: if *he* drew a shoe from the widow's foot, it would mean nothing. Hence, in the prophet's words, '*God* has withdrawn himself,' it is implied that *we* have not done so."[1]

2. In the Midrash on Koheleth (i. 8), a story is found which shews the extraordinary scrupulosity of the Rabbis in refusing the smallest semblance of approval to anything Christian. Rabbi Eliezer was accused of Christian tendencies (*Minhooth*). The governor—called by the Jewish transliteration of the Greek word ἡγεμών, and probably intended for some Roman procurator—asks him "how a person of his importance could condescend to such futilities?" "The Judge is the witness of my innocence," said Rabbi Eliezer — meaning God. But the governor supposed that this was an appeal to *him*, and at once pronounced him innocent. The Rabbi was, however, deeply hurt by the suspicion of Nazarene proclivities, and his disciples found him inconsolable. At last, R. Akibha came to comfort him, and said, "Perhaps some *Min* has said something to you which met with your approval?" "By heavens, yes!" answered R. Eliezer. "One day I met Jacob of Kephar Zekaniah in the main street of Sepphoris, and, alluding to Deuteronomy xxiii. 19, he remarked that although the Law forbade the application to the Temple service of the wages of impurity, they might perhaps be used to build baths, &c. 'You are right,' I said; but I could not at the moment recall any *halacha* on the subject.[2] When I had agreed to his

[1] Midrash on Psalm x.; Derenbourg, p. 357.

[2] This remark is a valuable illustration of the servile and outrageous devotion to mere precedent which characterizes all Rabbinism.

opinion, he said 'that it was what had been said by Jesus.' In spite of this, I did not withdraw my approval of the opinion, and so I have been accused of heretical tendencies." What this Jacob of Kephar Zekaniah—said to be meant for James, the Lord's brother—meant by attributing his remark to Jesus, is not clear, unless it be one more allusion to Mark vii. 19—a passage to the extreme importance of which, and to its rediscovered interpretation, I have already called attention in the pages of THE EXPOSITOR.

3. Another of these anecdotes is very famous, and is found twice in the Abhoda Zara, as well as elsewhere. R. Eliezer Ben Dama, a nephew of R. Ishmael, having been bitten by a serpent, Jacob of Kephar Zekaniah came and offered to heal him by the name of Jesus.[1] R. Ishmael did not permit this to be done. "Ben Dama," he exclaimed, "it is forbidden!" "Allow me to do it," said Jacob. "I will prove to you from the Law that it is permitted." However, before Jacob could produce his argument, the sick man died. "Happy Ben Dama," said his uncle; "thou hast died in purity, without violating a precept of the wise." This is one of the instances quoted in illustration of Ecclesiastes vii. 26, "Whoso pleaseth God shall escape from her; but the sinner shall be taken by her."

4. One of the anecdotes about the Christians found in the Midrash on Koheleth[2] is too gross to be quoted, and it is only charitable to suppose that, if it be not the mere baseless calumny inspired by raging hatred, it may have arisen from some con-

[1] *Cf.* Acts xix. 13; Abhoda Zara, § 27, 2. [2] Derenbourg, p. 363.

fusion, on the part of the Jews, between the Christians and some of the infamous sects which adopted and disgraced their name. It is certain that the furious allusions made by heathen writers to the asserted immoralities and Thyestean banquets of the Christians, had their origin in the orgies of Gnostic sects like the Nicolaitanes, who existed even in the first century; and just as the Gentiles confounded the Jews with the Christians, so the Jews might even unintentionally fail to draw a distinction between genuine Christianity and disgraceful Gnosticism.

5. I shall only adduce one other story, quoted by Derenbourg from the same source as the last, namely, the Talmudic Commentary on the Book of Ecclesiastes.[1] It tells us how R. Joshua was threatened even in his own family by the progress of Christian conversions. His nephew Hananja, arriving at Kephar Nahum, was bewitched by the *Mins* (heretics, *i.e.*, Christians) to such an extent, that they made him mount on an ass on the Sabbath day. When he returned to his uncle, Rabbi Joshua gave him an unguent which healed him from his bewitchment. But Joshua said to him, "Since you have heard the braying of the ass of that wicked one, you can remain no longer on the soil of Israel." Hananja therefore retired to Babylon, and there died in peace.

The expression, "the ass of that wicked one," is only too plainly and sadly an allusion to the ass ridden by our Lord in his triumphal entry into Jeru-

[1] It consists of three *Sedarim*, and though perhaps not older than the tenth century, probably contains traditions of great antiquity.

salem, to which there are frequent allusions in Christian and Mohammedan legends; and the suppression of the name of Jesus is in accordance with the practice, to which we have already referred, of only mentioning Him in an oblique and cryptographic manner. The Jews of past generations, when charged with having written blasphemies against the Founder of Christianity, used to reply that neither He nor the Christians were mentioned in the Talmud. The reply was, *in the letter*, true enough. From the editions of the Talmud which were expurgated—in consequence of the Christian censure or Jewish alarm—all passages which *overtly* bore on our Lord and his followers[1] were deliberately struck out; but other passages were left, where the meaning was deeply hidden, and the desperate attacks were only φωνᾶντα συνετοῖσιν. In the Basle edition of 1581, the Talmud was revised and mutilated by Marcus Marinus, but in the Cracow edition these passages were reinserted by the Jews of Poland, and they are also found in the Venice edition of 1520, and the Amsterdam edition of 1645. The Polish Jews soon became aware of the danger they incurred by their orthodox temerity in refusing to omit any passage of the Talmud, and they accordingly wrote a synodic letter, in which they ordered their Rabbis, in all future publications, to leave such passages blank, making in their stead a circle, to remind them that such passages were only to be taught to their pupils *vivâ voce*.[2] Generally Christ

[1] They have been collected and published separately. Talmud, *Chasronos Hashash*. "Separat. Ausgabe der von d. censur Gestrichenen Stellen d. Talmud." Könisgberg. (Oscar Richter. Leipzig.)

[2] Leslie, "A Short and Easy Method with the Jews." London. 1812. Chiarini, i. 165.

is alluded to as *Pelonî*, "that man," a term which we find even in the Acts of the Apostles;[1] "He whom we may not name;" Absalom; "the Hung" (Talooî, תָּלוּי, Deut. xxi. 23);[2] and such names as Ben Stada and Ben Pandera, which I have no space here to examine. The angry and wicked blasphemies of late and wretched works like the Toldôth Jeshu (Generation of Jesus), and the Maaseh Talooî ("Work of the Hung"), are regarded with just contempt by the Jews themselves.

6. In later times, however, when toleration of the most absolute kind has been established, there has been a tendency, on the part of some Jewish writers, to allegorize, yet at the same time to defend, or at any rate to extenuate, some of the worst Talmudic allusions.

The contrast between their language on the subject and that of their predecessors is instructive, and our readers must pardon the necessity for alluding to that which, even under the most allegorical treatment, cannot but shock and horrify their hearts.

There is a Rabbinic proverb which says, "Whoever ridicules the words of the wise is condemned to be boiled in hot ordure."

Now this proverb either originated in, or is applied by, a passage of the Talmud, in which is narrated the following story.[3]

Onkelos, the paraphrast of the Pentateuch, is said to have summoned from their graves the three

[1] Acts v. 28. [2] See my "Life of Christ," ii. 453.

[3] The reference to the Talmud is not given, but I take the story from a Jewish source—*Biblische und Thalmudische Studien*, in a paper entitled "Rabbi Joshua ben Hanania." The passage comes, I believe, from Gittin, 57. 1 (Venetian edition).

greatest representatives of the three principles hostile to Judaism, in order to question them upon the motives of their opposition.

The first was Titus, the second Balaam, the third was "*that man.*" ["The Jews," says the Jewish author from whom I derive the story, "according to the Law, dare not pronounce the name of Christ, since his being adored as God. Moses says, 'And make no mention of the name of other gods, neither let it be heard out of thy mouth.'"]

Onkelos asked all three of them, "Which people is the most esteemed in the other world?" and they severally answer, "Israel."

He then asked them, "Should a man try to be united to Israel?"

Titus, who represents worldly opposition to the Jews, answers that "it would be difficult, because their commandments are manifold."

Balaam, the representative of Satanic implacable hatred, says, "Thou shalt *not* seek their peace or their prosperity all thy days for ever."

THAT MAN answers, "Seek to do them good; avoid afflicting them: whoso injures them, injures the apple of his own eye."

"Go and see," continues the legend, "the difference that exists between a delinquent of Israel and a prophet of the heathen."

"What is Thy punishment?" asks Onkelos. I dare not write the answer, beyond saying that He replies that "He ridiculed the precepts of the wise."

Now Maimonides, in his preface to the Mishna, says that by "hot dung" is merely meant bad passions, which render us blind; and that *Nec est*

interim stercus fervens gravius stultitiâ quæ ipsum induxit ut illis illuderet. He therefore suppresses altogether the special polemical allusion.

But the modern Jewish author from whom I quote says: "Before concluding the report of the legend, we must remind the reader that the Prophet Ezekiel had formerly in his prophetic vision been condemned to eat bread baked of dung, which is afterwards explained by the filth of idol worship among the people of Israel. . . . By the Oriental image of moral filth, we can understand the termination of that remarkable legend. . . . There is no doubt that this dung, revolting as it may seem, signifies nothing but corrupt ideas of worship." He then proceeds to exalt and extol Christ at the expense of Christianity. He says that Christ's "only fault was deviating from the temporal institutions of the Sanhedrin, and that He in consequence fell into the hands of the heathen, who dishonour his memory by their anthropomorphism, blaspheming the Father of all in the name of one of his most devoted sons. There has always existed a misunderstanding on the part of Christians with regard to the Jewish estimation of Christ. We do not, we cannot, hate the Man, the learned and self-denying victim, who willingly sacrificed Himself to his own convictions. Yet our court of justice performed only its duty in condemning Him. He was as well acquainted with the law as were the judges who pronounced his doom, and therefore He besought his Father before his death to have mercy on those very judges by whose fiat He was crucified. Such is our holy law: the delinquent, after having undergone his punishment, is reinstated in his for-

mer dignity, and becomes our poor suffering brother with us." So that the general upshot of this singular modern apology for a passage which has usually been regarded as the very deadliest which the Talmud contains, is that "greater respect could not be paid to the personal character of Christ than in this allegory, which represents Him as praying even from the grave for his people, with undiminished love and esteem, and forgiving his enemies their bitterness and opposition, though they condemned Him to death!"

7. With one more Talmudic cryptograph I will conclude. It is a legend found in Niddah (xxiv. 6; xxv. a).

"Our masters related: Abba Saul says, 'I occupied myself with burying the dead. Once the soil gave way under my feet, and I found myself sunk up to my nose in the eye-hole of a dead body. When I returned, they said it was that of Absalom.'

"Now it may be thought that Abba Saul was a dwarf! But no, he was the tallest man of his age; Rabbi Tarphon stood but up to his shoulders. Rabbi Tarphon was the tallest man of his age, and R. Akibha stood but up to his shoulders. R. Akibha was the tallest man of his age, and R. Meir stood but up to his shoulders. R. Meir was the tallest man of his age, and R. Judah stood but up to his shoulders. R. Judah was the tallest man of his age, and R. Hija stood but up to his shoulders. R. Hija was the tallest man of his age, and Rabh stood but up to his shoulders. Rabh was the tallest man of his age, and Rabh Juda stood but up to his shoulders. Rabh Juda was the tallest man of his age, and Adda

Dialah stood but up to his shoulders. The pistachio tree of Pumbaditha reached but up to the shoulders of Adda Dialah, and common people were but half as tall as the pistachio tree of Pumbaditha."

It appears, then, that Abba Saul must have been as high as two men and ten heads; and if he sank up to the nose in the eye-socket of Absalom, Absalom's head must have been sixty times larger than a man's body, and Absalom himself three hundred and sixty times taller than an ordinary mortal. Many people have taken this story to be a piece of rampant and inexcusable absurdity. It has, however, a very simple meaning, which I may perhaps be allowed to explain in my next paper. F. W. FARRAR.

THE GOSPEL IN THE EPISTLES.

And by theim [*the Apostles*] *in like maner, first without writyng by onely wordes and prechynge so was it spredde abrode in the worlde that his faith was by the mouthes of his holy messengers put into mennes eres, and by his holy hande written in mennes hartes, or ever any worde thereof almost was written in the boke. . . . And I nothynge doubte but all had it so ben that never gospel hadde ben written, yet shoulde the substaunce of this faith never have fallen out of Christen folkes hartes, but the same spirit that planted it, the same shoulde have watered it, the same shoulde have kepte it, the same shoulde have encreased it. . . . And none Evangelist was there nor none Apostle that by writtyng ever sente the faith to any nacion, but if they were first enformed by worde and that God had begon his Church in that place.*— Sir THOMAS MORE'S *Works* [ed. 1557], pp. 158, 159.

THE writer of the above extract evidently thought that those persons to whom the Apostolic Letters were addressed could have constructed for themselves a Gospel, had no work of any Evangelist ever appeared. By an analysis of four of these Epistles, we have endeavoured to make this plain. We pur-

pose now, by following the historical order of the Gospel story, to give synthetically an outline of what must have been taught to the Churches of Rome, Corinth, and Galatia, before they could have been fit to receive and comprehend the Letters which are addressed to them.

They could have been no strangers to language like that in which St. John, in the opening words of his Gospel, speaks of the pre-existence of the Creative Word. They had heard by oral teaching of "the one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him;"[1] and also that "Jesus Christ was the Son of God, made of the seed of David according to the flesh."[2] Nay, they must have heard much more than this to be able to comprehend statements set before them with such brevity. The simple story of Mary his mother, who was of the house and lineage of David, must have been orally communicated to them; and, with it, of course those miraculous details which made it possible for St. Paul to speak to them of the Son of Mary as being also the Son of God. And, besides this, they must also have been told of the lowly life which Jesus led among men, and that He could say of Himself that He had not where to lay his head, before St. Paul could write concerning the grace of Christ, "Though he were rich, yet for your sakes he became poor."[3] But they must also have known that Jesus claimed to be the hope of the Jews, the promised Redeemer, and, as St. Matthew calls Him, not only the Son of David, but the Son of Abraham. For without comment St. Paul writes, "To Abraham and his seed

[1] 1 Cor. viii. 6. [2] Rom. i. 3. [3] 2 Cor. viii. 9.

were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ."[1] Moreover, to those to whom the Apostle could speak thus, "If when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life;"[2] or thus, "Our Lord Jesus Christ who gave himself for our sins;" there could have been no lack of knowledge concerning that heavenly message which at the birth of Jesus proclaimed glad tidings to all people, because One was now born "who should save his people from their sins." And that this Child, whose birth was so marvellously heralded and wondrously foretold, lived as a Jew among the Jews, and submitted to all the rules of the Jewish religion, must have been explained fully to them; for St. Paul has no occasion to say more, in speaking of Jesus, than that He was "made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law."[3] This story of the miraculous birth and the childhood of Jesus must have been completely recited to those for whom so brief a sentence was enough. And we cannot think that those later proclamations of the Divinity of Jesus which the Baptist made could have been left unmentioned among those who were told that "Christ died for our sins."[4] For how more fitly could it be explained that the sacrifice of Christ was able to do away sins, than by such testimony as John gave when he said, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sins of the world"?

They must have been told how "the twelve,"[5]

[1] Gal. iii. 16. [2] Rom. v. 10. [3] Gal. iv. 4, 5.
[4] 1 Cor. xv. 3. [5] Ibid. xv. 5.

whom St. Paul mentions with no more words than these, came to be chosen as the disciples of Jesus, and must likewise have heard of their names; for in the same passage Cephas and James are alluded to as though their names and history would be familiar to every Christian congregation. The call, therefore, on the Sea of Galilee, and all the circumstances of the life at Capernaum, must have entered into the narrative which had been orally communicated to the Christian Church of Corinth, and indeed to all the Churches; for with just the same brevity does he allude to James, Cephas, and John, who "seemed to be pillars,"[1] when he is writing to the Galatians. How these three had come to occupy that prominent place in the early society must also have been told; and also how these very men received special marks of the Lord's confidence, and were admitted into an intimacy with Him closer than that which was allowed to the rest of the Twelve. Their own eyes had seen how these early disciples of Jesus had come abroad to preach the glad tidings of his kingdom; and when the first teachers came to any church, their opening address could not have failed to contain a notice that from the beginning Jesus had sent forth his followers to spread the gospel and win converts to the faith, and had commanded that this new institution of preaching should be continued and extended after He had been taken away. With the miracles of Jesus the Epistles naturally do not deal. The apostles had learned from their Master that words like "Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thine house," were only spoken, and followed by the restoration of the afflicted

[1] Gal. ii. 9.

man, in order that men should believe that Jesus was possessed of a greater power—that of healing the soul by the forgiveness of sins. And, above all, every other miracle was rendered needless, as the ground of an appeal to the faith of the world, when Christ had triumphed over death and risen from the grave. On the Resurrection, the Letters of St. Paul insist in every page. It is "by the resurrection from the dead that Jesus is declared to be the Son of God with power."[1] It will be imputed unto us for righteousness "if we believe on him who raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead."[2] For "Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father."[3] And as "God hath raised up the Lord, so will he also raise us up by his own power."[4] And it is from God who raised up Jesus, for whom He is an ambassador, that our Apostle claims his commission: "Paul, an apostle, not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead."[5] For evidence that Christ was truly the Son of God they neither could nor would desire to go beyond the proof furnished by his empty grave. But the case was different with the *words* which Jesus had spoken while alive. These his disciples were to make known to all the world; and the spirit of this teaching, which was utterly new to the world, is found throughout these Epistles of St. Paul. We have already[6] largely illustrated this similarity of tone between the Gospels and the Epistles, and have especially pointed out how much of the solemn language of the discourses preserved to us by St. John

[1] Rom. i. 4. [2] Ibid. iv. 24. [3] Ibid. vi. 4. [4] 1 Cor. vi. 14.
[5] Gal. i. 1. [6] THE EXPOSITOR, vol. v. pp. 451, *et seq.*

is anticipated in the Letters which we have been examining. But the subject is not nearly exhausted. For example, how unlike to any teaching which men had ever heard before was the saying of Christ, "Be ye wise as serpents, and *harmless* as doves."[1] The world had encouraged the acquisition of wisdom after its own fashion, but the latter clause of Christ's sentence was alien to any teaching but his own. Yet St. Paul, in writing to the Romans, exhorts them in precisely the same strain in which Jesus had spoken to the Seventy. "I would have you wise unto that which is good, and *simple* concerning evil;" where he employs the same word in the original for *simple* as, in the sentence from the Gospel, is translated *harmless*. The word (ἀκέραιος) is not a common word, and signifies—literally—*pure, unadulterated.* St. Paul uses it once more—and only once more—in writing to the Philippians: "That ye may be blameless and *harmless*."[2] And we can hardly suppose the Apostle to have employed it except as having in his mind the previous utterance of Jesus, and in writing to persons to whom the now almost proverbial expression of the Lord had become familiar. The sentiment is repeated by him again when he writes, "If any man among you seemeth to be wise in this world, let him become a fool, that he may be wise."[3] And once more in the same Epistle, "Brethren be not children in understanding; howbeit in malice be ye children, but in understanding be men."[4]

Before the preaching of Christ it was only in dim vision that a future life was made known, even to the

[1] Matt. x. 16. [2] Phil. ii. 15. [3] 1 Cor. iii. 18. [4] Ibid. xiv. 20.

Chosen People. It was Christ who brought life and immortality to light. Of the lot of man after death He is reported to have spoken thus in the Gospels: "The Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and then shall he reward every man according to his works."[1] The teaching of the first preachers would not have been complete without the communication of this heaven-sent revelation. And that they did set it forth we can see clearly from the words which St. Paul is able to use to the Roman Church, and also to the Corinthians. To the former he writes, addressing an impenitent sinner: "Thou treasurest up to thyself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God; who will render to every man according to his deeds."[2] To the Corinthians he says, "He that planteth and he that watereth are one; and every man shall receive his own reward according to his own labour."[3] And in his Second Epistle even more fully: "We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad."[4] The world had known nothing of these solemn truths before the appearance of Jesus Christ, and it could only have been by the oral teaching of the first Christian missionaries that the congregations in Rome and Corinth had been instructed in them; and yet we find the Apostle alluding to them as teachings with which they were all sure to be familiar. How truly, too, is the spirit of Christ's teaching in the Gospel on mercy to the erring set forth in the Epistles of St. Paul,

[1] Matt. xvi. 27. [2] Rom. ii. 5, 6. [3] 1 Cor. iii. 8. [4] 2 Cor. v. 10.

although this was no common teaching before Christ came into the world. We seem to hear the Lord's "He that is without sin among you let him cast the first stone," as we read, "Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye that are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted;"[1] and in these, "We then that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves."[2] Had it not been known that these were among the precepts of the Master, his disciples would hardly have been bold enough to originate such lessons, and would surely have found it impossible to win acceptance for them. Nor would it have fared better with those lessons of consideration for others which are to be found in passages such as, "Take heed lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumbling-block to them that are weak;"[3] or, again, in the same Epistle, "Let no man seek his own, but every man his neighbour's well-being."[4] Neither were lessons of universal benevolence ever inculcated before the coming of Christ, nor could they have been enforced on Christian congregations unless those congregations had already received them as among the words of Jesus. When these had been heard, but not before, it was possible for St. Paul to write to the Galatians, "As we have opportunity, let us do good unto all men;"[5] and to the Romans: "Bless them which persecute you, and recompense to no man evil for evil;"[6] or to write his wondrous eulogy on Christian charity;[7] or to pen the words, which seem

[1] Gal. vi. 1. [2] Rom. xv. 1. [3] 1 Cor. viii. 9. [4] Ibid. x. 24.
[5] Gal. vi. 10. [6] Rom. xii. 14–17. [7] 1 Cor. xiii.

like a brief summary of the life of the Master Himself, "I will very gladly spend and be spent for you; though the more abundantly I love you, the less I be loved." [1] It was only when Christ had preached and practised such love as this, only when He had prayed for his murderers, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do," that such a spirit was inspired into men. And to have spoken to these Christian congregations in such language would have been impossible had they not known of the teaching of that Master in whose footsteps St. Paul strove to tread.

After what has just been said, in addition to those illustrations which we have before [2] given of the great resemblance which exists between many of the teachings of St. Paul and the authoritative utterances of Christ in the Sermon on the Mount, as well as between the language attributed to the Saviour and that used by the Apostle on such subjects as the last judgment, the power of faith, the influence of the Spirit, and the office of the Holy Ghost, we feel that no more need be adduced to shew how entirely these Epistles, written so long anterior to the publication of any Gospel, accord with the lessons of our blessed Lord. Their brief injunctions, almost always unaccompanied by a reason, would have found no response in the hearts of those to whom they were addressed, had not the teaching of Christ, orally communicated by the earliest preachers, prepared the way for the practical application of his lessons by those on whom should come the care of the Churches.

[1] 2 Cor. xii. 15. [2] THE EXPOSITOR, vol. v. p. 453.

But not only were the lessons which Christ gave to his disciples made known to the first-founded Churches, but from the fact that the apostles themselves were the first missionaries, the early congregations, to which St. Paul wrote, were well informed on the personal history of the apostolic band and of those who had lived with Jesus. Thus it comes to pass that St. Paul can allude without explanation to the circumstance of Peter's marriage, and the marriage of some of the brethren of our Lord; and speak of "the other apostles" [1] in such general phrase as makes us quite sure that further explanation was not needed by those to whom he was writing.

How entirely in accord with what was afterwards made public in the Gospels is St. Paul's expression, "The Jews require a sign!" [2] How thoroughly does it represent to us the oft-repeated demand, "Master, we would see a sign from thee." [3] And whence did St. Paul derive that unusual simile of the leaven, which he so frequently employs—as, for example, in the phrase, "Purge out therefore the old leaven"? [4] and how did it become so familiar in the Churches, that they at once recognized its meaning, if not from the use which the Lord Himself made of the word when speaking of the corrupt teaching of the Pharisees and the corrupt practices of the Herodians? So that, not only the substance, but the phraseology and very words of Jesus are to be traced in these Letters, and were used because they would appeal to the first teaching which the Churches had received. How like in tenour too is that language

[1] 1 Cor. ix. 5; Gal. i. 19. [2] 1 Cor. i. 22. [3] Matt. xii. 38.
[4] 1 Cor. v. 7, and several times in the same chapter.

of St. Paul where he says, "God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise, and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things that are mighty," [1] to that thanksgiving of Jesus, "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes: even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight."[2]

With the events which the Gospels record concerning the last days of our Lord's life, the Churches to whom these Letters were written must have been most thoroughly acquainted. They knew that the solemn meal which our Lord ate with his disciples was eaten on the evening of "the same night on which he was betrayed." But we cannot suppose for a moment that the details of the preparation for that feast, which the Lord had so earnestly desired to eat with his disciples before He suffered, had been omitted from the narrative to which they had listened. Rather must we believe that as the institution of the Lord's Supper took place on that evening, and was to continue as a sacred memorial in the Christian Church for ever; and as the abolition of the Paschal Sacrifice was now to be made, and the simple reception of bread and wine to take its place, both Jewish and Gentile audiences would need to hear the whole history of those events which led up to the appointment of the Christian Sacrament. They must have heard that the Lord looked upon it as the precursor of his own sacrifice. When they could, in such short phrase, be reminded of Christ's betrayal, the story of

[1] 1 Cor. i. 27. [2] Matt. xi. 25.

Iscariot's crime must have been fixed in every memory. No doubt they had been told, too, how Christ, during the Supper, had shewn that He could read what was in the heart of his treacherous follower. And no detail of the crime would be omitted,—the bargain with the Jews, the thirty pieces of silver, the kiss as a sign, the terror of the band of soldiers, the remorse of Judas, his return and confession, how the Jews scorned at his restoration of the blood-money, and how in despair he went out and hanged himself. We cannot believe that one word of all this was unfamiliar to the Corinthian congregation, when, in order to recall it to their memories, only that brief sentence needed to be written which begins, "The Lord Jesus in the same night in which he was betrayed."

Nor can we believe that those solemn discourses, which St. John records as having been uttered at the Paschal Feast, were left undescribed to the audiences to which the first disciples preached. Have we not the echo of those mysterious teachings time after time in these Letters of St. Paul? Christ had said, "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever." [1] Exactly in the same tenour does St. Paul write to the Romans: "Ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father;" [2] and a little afterwards in the same Chapter, "The Spirit helpeth our infirmities: for we know not what we should pray for as we ought: but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered." [3]

In speaking of the same gift of the Spirit, Jesus

[1] John xiv. 16. [2] Rom. viii. 15. [3] Ibid. viii. 26.

says again, "The world cannot receive him, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him."[1] In words that can have no other source than this, St. Paul writes, "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."[2] And with what full meaning do those further words of Jesus in the same Chapter—"Yet a little while, and the world seeth me no more; but ye see me: because I live, ye shall live also"[3]—come before us when, after the Resurrection, we hear them thus translated, so to speak, by St. Paul: "Now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the firstfruits of them that slept."[4] These sublime Chapters of St. John's Gospel would furnish us with abundant material for illustrating this portion of our subject; but as the reader can supply many of the instances from his own memory, we will be content with quoting only two more from the succeeding Chapters, that it may be seen how fully the sense of the whole discourse is reproduced in the Apostolic Letters. Jesus says, "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."[5] With the full consciousness of what was about to come upon Him on the following day, Christ uttered these words. He knew, too, that those who heard Him would soon shew their weakness by forsaking Him in his hour of arrest. Yet He hesitated not to die for them, although they were, as St. Paul puts it, "without strength." And read the words which follow in the Epistle: "For scarcely for a righteous

[1] John xiv. 17. [2] 1 Cor. ii. 14. [3] John xiv. 19.
[4] 1 Cor. xv. 20. [5] John xv. 13.

man will one die: yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die. But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." [1] We cannot but feel as we read these sentences that there must have been fully set before the Roman Christians the teaching which Christ embodied in this last solemn discourse. And this feeling is deepened and confirmed when we compare the prayer of Jesus—"That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me"[2]—with the Apostle's words to the Romans, "We, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another;" [3] or to the Galatians, "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." [4] When we reflect that the Gospel of St. John was not written till long after the time when St. Paul penned these Epistles, we see that the whole body of believers must have been instructed orally in the truths of the Gospel long before any one of the Gospels was composed.

That they were familiar with the details of the death of Christ, we might infer from the constant mention in these Epistles of the Cross of Christ, as that in which the Apostle gloried, although it was foolishness to the Gentiles and a stumbling-block to the Jews. The manner of the death, by crucifixion, must have stamped the procedure as a judicial act of the Roman power; and the facts which we possess in

[1] Rom. v. 7, 8. [2] John xvii. 21. [3] Rom. xii. 5. [4] Gal. iii. 27, 28.

the Gospels must have been recounted, in order to explain how the malice of the Jews gained over the executive power of their conquerors to work out its desire. We have only to read the brief summary of the last events of the earthly history of Christ which is given by St. Paul to the Romans, to know how current the whole Gospel history of these events was. All that he says is, "To this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be the Lord both of the dead and living."[1] And with like brevity are the Ascension and the second Advent alluded to in the same Letter: "Who is he that condemneth? Is it Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us?"[2] And, again, "God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel."[3] The baptism by which all converts were admitted into the Christian Communion was not likely to be administered before the converts had been taught that this Sacrament also was of Christ's own institution, and specially appointed as the sign of a covenant between Him and his followers. The long enumeration[4] of the appearances of Jesus after his resurrection which St. Paul gives, with almost the bareness of a catalogue, demonstrates how completely the whole narrative of the forty days had been made plain by the words of preachers; for how, otherwise, would it have been possible for the Apostle to preface a solemn argument with a list so meagre of details? The memories of those to whom he wrote could supply the particulars of each appearance, and it was

[1] Rom. xiv. 9. [2] Ibid. viii. 34. [3] Ibid. ii. 16. [4] 1 Cor. xv. 5–8.

enough for his purpose to give a simple enumeration.

Thus, from the birth of Jesus to his ascension, there is little in his life or teaching to which some allusion cannot be found in these Letters of St. Paul. His Jewish parentage, his miraculous birth, his humble life, his kindred in the flesh, his chosen companions, his precepts to them and to the multitude—precepts so novel that the world had never heard the like before they came from the lips of Jesus—his new ordinance of preaching, his persecution by the Jews, his death at the hands of the Roman authorities, the treachery of his disciple, the Sacraments for the observance of his Church, his resurrection, his manifestations of Himself to his disciples, his ascent into heaven—all these things must have been heard of till they were thoroughly well known by the Congregations for whom these Letters of St. Paul were written, and to whom the briefest allusions were enough to quicken the memory of what they had heard. Ere a word of the book of the Gospel was written, the Gospel itself was imprinted by oral teaching on the hearts of scores of Congregations. And it is one—and that not the least—of our many guarantees for the accuracy of the Gospels we now hold in our hands, that they were accepted with one consent by Churches, which, both from the oral and epistolary teaching of the Apostles themselves, had long been familiar with the life and teachings of Christ Jesus the Lord.

J. RAWSON LUMBY.

THE APOSTLE PHILIP.

THERE is reason to believe that all the apostles, so far as their special characters are set before us in Scripture, were intended to be representative of different classes of minds which should, from age to age, be found within the Church. This is very obvious with respect to some of them. Peter is at once felt to be typical of the ardent and the zealous, John of the loving and contemplative, Thomas of the distrustful and the hesitating, and Nathanael (or Bartholomew) of the simple, the guileless, the sincere. And seeing that each of these immediate followers of Christ appears so plainly to stand, as it were, at the head of a vast multitude of others who have since his day arisen in the Church, it may not be fanciful, but the reverse, to discover, in the few hints which we find respecting some of the rest of the apostles, indications that they too are to be regarded as representative of special types of character, which should, from time to time, be manifested by the followers of Christ.

What type of character, then, we may ask, is Philip to be taken as representing? In answer to this question we seem warranted in saying that that Apostle comes before us in Scripture as the representative of those who may be variously, yet harmoniously, described as the *inquiring* and the *speculative:* as persons who are eager and zealous in following out what they have already ascertained to be truth; and who may sometimes, by pushing this spirit of investigation too far, miss that repose of mind which they might otherwise have enjoyed.

We shall refer by-and-by to a remarkable illustration of this type of character which has been furnished in a celebrated writer and thinker of recent times. But let us first of all see whether the accounts which we possess of the Apostle Philip are such as to fit in with and substantiate that idea of his mental tendencies and habits which has been suggested.

The passage which throws the clearest light upon Philip's character is found in Chapter xiv. of St. John's Gospel. We there read (*Verses* 8, 9) that, as Jesus was speaking to his disciples, "Philip saith unto him, Lord, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us. Jesus saith unto him, Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? he that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then, Shew us the Father?" It is evident that the Apostle is here manifesting an unduly inquisitive spirit. He shews himself ardently desirous of obtaining a full acquaintance with the most momentous of all subjects; but he is at the same time betrayed by his blinding eagerness into overlooking those advantages which were in fact within his reach, and which, if properly improved, would have led to the satisfaction which he desired. We cannot but think that Philip had long been pondering the request which he now so earnestly addresses to his Master. To reach a full and satisfying knowledge of the Father, to behold in some sensible and striking form the glory of the invisible God, was the great desire which for a time had been slumbering in his heart. And now he finds an opportunity, which he at once and eagerly embraces, of giving utterance to this long-cherished

wish. Christ has been speaking of the many mansions in his Father's house; and after declaring that the object of his temporary departure was to prepare a place among these for his disciples, has said unto them, "And whither I go ye know, and the way ye know." Upon this Thomas, with characteristic distrust and caution, exclaims, "Lord, we know not whither thou goest; and how can we know the way?" *His* implied doubts and questionings are set at rest by the impressive and comprehensive words of Jesus: "I am the way, and the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father but by me;" and then the Saviour adds: "If ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also; and from henceforth ye do know him, and have seen him." But now has come the opportunity which Philip desired. The words of Christ touch upon that very point which has attracted his own earnest attention, and roused his deepest curiosity. He has hitherto kept silent respecting it, fearing perhaps lest there might be something improper, or even impious, in giving utterance to the thoughts and wishes which have been excited within him. But now that very language which *he* hesitated to employ has been made use of by Christ Himself. The Saviour has spoken of "seeing" the Father; and his disciple, feeling that he might now venture to express those feelings which had hitherto found no vent in language, but had on that very account burned all the more hotly in his bosom, exclaims with almost breathless impetuosity, "Lord, *shew* us the Father, and it sufficeth us."

The impression thus made upon our minds as to

the special character of Philip is confirmed by all else that we learn regarding him. Only in three other passages is he brought prominently before us in the Gospels, and each of these sustains the belief that he was of a peculiarly inquiring spirit—a spirit so far good and commendable, but which, unless watched and checked, might easily pass into the phase of mere curious inquiry or unprofitable speculation. The first time he is presented to us is when, after himself being called by Christ, we are told (John i. 45): "Philip findeth Nathanael, and saith unto him, We have found him, of whom *Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write,* Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph." These words indicate that Philip was led to acknowledge the Messiahship of Jesus, only as the result of studious investigation. He had carefully examined the statements of Moses and the prophets, and it was not till he had found that they had their exact fulfilment in Jesus of Nazareth, that he enrolled himself among the Saviour's disciples. The same tendency to inquiry is suggested by the manner in which he replies to the prejudices of him whom he addressed. "Nathanael," we are told, "said unto him, Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth?" and Philip, dealing with this objection in the only way which, had it occurred to himself, he would have felt satisfactory, urges Nathanael to a personal examination of the point at issue, and replies, "Come and *see.*" In perfect harmony with all this are the two other occasions on which he is presented to us in the Gospels. At John vi. 5–7, we read: "When Jesus lifted up his eyes, and saw a great company

come unto him, he saith unto Philip, Whence shall we buy bread, that these may eat? And this he said to prove him: for he himself knew what he would do. Philip answered him, Two hundred pennyworth of bread is not sufficient for them, that every one of them may take a little." The special appeal which Christ made at this time to Philip has greatly perplexed the commentators. Alford remarks: "Why to *Philip* does not appear: perhaps some reason lay in the *πειράζων αὐτὸν*, which is now lost to us. . . . I would take the circumstance as simple matter of fact, implying perhaps that Philip was nearest to our Lord at the moment." Even Bengel seems here at fault. He can only say by way of explanation: "Boni doctoris est ex grege discipulorum unum aliquem, cui opus est, interdum provocare. Fortasse Philippus etiam rem alimentariam curabat inter discipulos." But with the clue we have already found to Philip's special character, the particular appeal now made by Christ to him seems full of meaning. The hint contained in the *πειράζων αὐτὸν* of the Evangelist is not, in the language of Alford, "lost to us." On the contrary, the object of Christ is clear. He knew the peculiar character of Philip. Long ere Jesus spake, that disciple, in accordance with his constitutional tendency, had been questioning with himself *how* that great multitude could possibly be fed. He had even calculated the exact sum which would be required to buy bread for them, so that every one might "take a little." The instantaneous answer which he gives to his Master's question shews that his mind had been busily en-

gaged with the problem to be solved; and thus we see how much point there was in the question which Christ now asked being addressed to him rather than to any other of the apostles.

Again we read (John xii. 20–22): "And there were certain Greeks among them that came up to worship at the feast: the same came therefore to Philip, who was of Bethsaida of Galilee, and desired him, saying, Sir, we would see Jesus. Philip cometh and telleth Andrew: and again Andrew and Philip tell Jesus." Here, likewise, the commentators are puzzled. "For what reason," says Alford, "*Philip* was selected, it is impossible to say." And if this were the only passage in which that Apostle was mentioned, we should at once admit the truth of the remark. There is certainly nothing in the passage taken by itself to give any indication of Philip's character, or to enable us in any way to understand why the Greeks applied to him. But if the idiosyncrasy of the Apostle was really such as we have already appeared to find it, there does not seem any impossibility, or even any great difficulty, in accounting for the fact in question. Lange vaguely suggests the explanation when he says, "Perhaps their turning first to him depended upon a law of kindly attraction."[1] He does not say in what this attraction consisted, but, after the light which we have found other passages shedding on the special character of the Apostle, there does not seem much difficulty in discovering it. The Greeks referred to had, doubtless, inquired beforehand respecting those most in the confidence of Jesus. They would wish to ascer-

[1] "Life of Christ," iv. 53.

tain which one of his immediate followers was likely to shew most sympathy with the request they were to make. And may we not say that Philip would soon be selected as the man? He, if any one, would feel with, and assist, those labouring under the influence of an inquiring spirit. Without refining unduly on the subject, we may be allowed to observe that the passage under consideration fits in admirably with all we have already ascertained respecting Philip. There seems an obvious congruity in the fact that that disciple who had formerly invited Nathanael to "come and *see*" the Saviour, and whose own great wish, the wish which at last he ventured to carry to his Master, was, "Lord, I would *see* the Father," should now be the one appealed to for sympathy and aid by these eager supplicants, when the request which they had to prefer was expressed in the words, "Sir, *we* would *see* Jesus."

Such, then, is the kind of character of which the Apostle Philip is the type: and it may now be worth while to let our minds dwell for a little both on the excellences which it exhibits and on the dangers to which it is exposed.

An inquiring spirit—properly so called—is of the utmost importance in every department of human activity and achievement. It is those who have been in the habit of asking questions of Nature, and pressing for answers to them, that have been chiefly instrumental in extending the boundaries of knowledge. Others have been satisfied with what was already ascertained. They have been content to be hemmed in by that circle of darkness which sur-

rounded them, and have made no attempt to explore its mysteries, or to widen the circumference within which the light of science is enjoyed. But inquisitive and reflecting minds, by the unceasing questions which they put, have laboured to add something to the amount of man's knowledge, and have thus, at times, been led by the simplest incidents to a discovery of some of the most dominant and comprehensive laws of the universe. It is those who follow up Science to her most advanced outpost, and who, while standing there, inquire if it be not possible to take yet a further step, and to bring something more of earth and heaven within the domain of human cognizance, that are the real contributors to the advancement and elevation of our race. Others may conserve, but they, as it were, create. Others may be silent and receptive, but they are inquiring and communicative. And although many of their inquiries may not be answered by themselves, or in their own day, yet, by instituting them, they have given an impulse and direction to the human mind, which will, in all probability, hereafter lead to the desired success. Again and again has this proved to be the case. All those marvellous discoveries and equally marvellous applications of science, as also all those social improvements, those deliverances from long-prevalent errors and superstitions, which our own day has so largely witnessed, have flowed from the efforts of men who were bold enough to put some question which others had never asked, or to follow out to their proper results inquiries which had been suggested by their predecessors.

Now this spirit of reflection and inquiry, so valuable in other departments, is also of great importance within the province of religion. It is melancholy to think of the multitudes who hold what faith they have in the gospel simply as a matter of tradition. They have shewn none of the spirit of Philip in examining into the grounds on which their belief rests; and hence they have not attained an intelligent and established faith. The evil consequence is twofold. On the one hand, many of the class referred to cling to their traditional beliefs with an obstinacy which takes no account of reason, and which is fatal to all progressive spiritual enlightenment. On the other hand, numbers who have taken no pains to be able to "give a reason of the hope that is in them," are apt to be carried away by any wind of doctrine which happens, for the time, to prevail—by any sort of heresy or scepticism which enjoys a temporary power and popularity. Nothing, then, is more important than to cherish a spirit of earnest and sustained inquiry with respect to all that falls within the domain of religion. There should be a sincere desire for "light," and for "more light." We cannot but feel that it is a noble, even though misdirected, wish to which Philip gave utterance when he exclaims, "Lord, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us." This language is enough to prove that his thoughts were habitually fixed on things spiritual and eternal. Only a man living far above the passions and pursuits of the world would have been prompted to make such a request. His ambition was of the loftiest and purest character. It did not limit itself to the honours, the pleasures, or the riches of earth,

but it vaulted upwards to a vision of God Himself. We behold more than an eagle's flight in the aspiration of Philip. We see the grand uprising of an immortal spirit to its native heaven — the sublime outburst of a soul which has awakened to its own vast capacities and wants, and which is persuaded that its necessities can be met only in communion with the Infinite and the Eternal.

But we must now notice the dangers which beset those who are possessed of a disposition like Philip, and the errors into which they are apt to be betrayed. A strongly *inquisitive* spirit is ever apt to become an unduly *speculative* one, and thus to waste itself in efforts which lead to no practical results. Thus had it been, to some extent, with Philip. He had allowed his mind to dwell on the great subject which specially attracted him, to the neglect of that source of instruction and satisfaction which was graciously placed within his reach. Only too many examples might be cited of men who, in the domain of earthly science, have, as it were, walked in his steps. They have been earnestly inquisitive, and so far well; but they have also become unduly speculative, and then have fallen into error. But let us restrict ourselves to the spiritual province, and find our illustration in John Foster, the eminent writer and thinker referred to in the beginning of this paper. A man of profound reflectiveness and earnest faith, he has made some contributions to the literature of our country which will probably live as long as the language itself. He has also left a number of expositions and illustrations of Scripture which are almost unequalled for the energy and originality they display. But he

was unfortunately too prone to indulge in vain and unprofitable speculation. Like Philip, he was always wishing to *see* what mortal eye has never seen; and thus he missed, to some extent, that tranquillity of spirit which he might otherwise have possessed. This tendency manifested itself in several ways, but was especially shewn in his speculations as to the state into which the soul is ushered after death. Again and again does he recur to this mysterious subject, and it is sometimes almost painful to mark the impatience which he exhibits in regard to it. "How strange," he says, "that revelation itself has kept it completely veiled." And while concluding that this concealment must be part of the "punitive economy" under which, on account of our sins, we are at present placed, he still allows himself, in a somewhat daring and unyielding spirit, to exclaim, "But that mysterious hereafter! We must submit to feel that we *are* in the dark. . . . Still, a contemplative spirit hovers with insuppressible inquisitiveness about the dark frontier, beyond which it *knows* that wonderful realities are existing, realities of greater importance to it than the whole world on this side of that limit. We watch for some glimmer through any part of the solemn shade, but still are left to the faint dubious resources of analogy, imagination, and conjecture." And in this spirit of unrest he proceeds to harass himself with a long list of questions respecting the unseen world, which, all the time, he felt could not possibly be answered.[1] Now this is an illustration of the way in which proper and profitable inquiry may pass into useless and injurious specula-

[1] Foster's "Life and Correspondence," ii. 197.

tion. Such vain questionings tend to turn away the mind from that truth which *has* been graciously revealed to us, and from Him who is the living Truth, the Centre of all revelation, and the sole Author of peace and satisfaction to the soul. While Philip vexed himself with wishes for an apocalypse of the invisible Jehovah, he forgot that he was in the immediate presence of One who was "the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of his person." Hence the Saviour kindly but decisively rebuked the spirit which his disciple had displayed. In answer to Philip's eager cry, "Lord, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us;" Jesus, we are told, said unto him, "Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then, Shew us the Father?"

Precious words for all human generations! It is extremely difficult, or rather impossible, for us to form any idea of a pure impalpable Spirit. We may strive to think of such a Being, but the mind labours to no purpose in every such attempt. We feel that in spite of ourselves we are attributing an outward form to the object of our conception, or that, if we resolutely struggle against this, it is only to substitute for some corporeal representation entire and absolute vacuity. But here the statement of Christ comes to our aid, "He that hath seen *me* hath seen the *Father*." We are thus warranted, when we think of God, in conceiving of Him as revealed through Jesus Christ. And this furnishes something which the mind can grasp—a tangible outward reality which can be felt in thinking of the Almighty. Nature

always seems to hold a screen between us and her Author. No living form appears among the works of God to impart warmth and reality to the homage which we offer Him. We look at the towering mountain, and are awed by its majesty; we contemplate the starry heavens, and are impressed with their grandeur; but still there is a veil between us and the great Being who called them into existence. They speak in no audible voice to give us a feeling of companionship; they exhibit no living presence to draw forth our love and adoration. Except on some rare occasions, and these probably altogether unknown in the lives of multitudes, it is only a cold and distant and unsatisfying worship which is paid to the God of Nature, if thought of apart from the God of Revelation. But how different is the feeling when the Christ of Scripture rises up before us as a visible embodiment of the Divine perfections! We see Him a living presence by our side. We hear Him speaking words for our encouragement and guidance. His love breathes upon us in the many promises of the gospel; his hand seems to touch us in the manifold miracles of mercy which He performs; and we cling to Him with that importunate and lively faith which will not let Him go except He bless us. Yes; "He that hath seen Christ hath seen the Father." The heathen may still bow before the altar of an "unknown God;" the philosopher may still perplex himself with endeavours to form some conception of the Great Supreme, whom, after all, he confesses to be incomprehensible: but the Christian bows with a deep sense of reality and satisfaction before the

footstool of the Eternal, knowing that though "no man hath seen God at any time, the only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." A. ROBERTS.

TITUS AND CRETE.

(*An Introduction to a brief Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to Titus.*)

ST. PAUL conferred upon a few of his friends and fellow-workers an immortality of remembrance by simply referring to them in one or more of his Epistles. Some of these, like Apollos, Timothy, Trophimus, Silas, Crispus, Aquila, and Priscilla, are also mentioned in the Acts. On the other hand, all that we know of Titus is gathered from the Letters of St. Paul. It is impossible to explain the silence of St. Luke with reference to an energetic fellow-labourer so fully trusted and so highly commended by the Apostle, and one to whom a Letter of so much interest was subsequently addressed. Conjectures on this subject have not been wanting, but they have scarcely the support of ingenious plausibility. The supposition that he was the *Titus*, or *Titius Justus*, of some Manuscripts[1] of the Acts (xviii. 7), is, if genuine, scarcely compatible with the fact that Titus accompanied Paul and Barnabas on the visit to Jerusalem described in Acts xv., a circumstance vouched for by Paul in Galatians ii. 1. The attempt to identify him with either Luke or Timothy or Silvanus (Silas) fails when we remember that Paul speaks

[1] ℵ, E, D, and sundry cursives constitute this authority. Tischendorf (eighth edition) introduces the word Titius, not Titus, into his text. Tregelles brings it into his margin.

of him as a Greek, and lays emphasis on the fact that each of these other friends of his had been circumcised. Grave difficulties beset each of the identifications on other grounds.[1] Some writers have urged, in explanation of St. Luke's silence, that Luke and Paul were not in one another's company when Titus received his most serious commissions, and that therefore Luke had no occasion for mentioning his presence. This cannot be proved, for St. Paul must have rejoined Luke at Philippi about the very time that the Apostle came from Troas to Macedonia, impelled by restless anxiety for the news which Titus was to bring him from Corinth. Besides, Luke appears to have remained in Philippi through the whole of the memorable journey from that city to Berea, Athens, and Corinth; and yet his memoirs betray ample traces of an intimate acquaintance with all its details. We therefore regard the problem as insoluble, and class it with other inexplicable silences of holy Scripture.

The Epistles of St. Paul draw the portrait of the man with tolerable distinctness. Young Timothy was the son of a Greek by the Jewess Eunice; but before he had been so impressed by the teaching and perils of St. Paul as to become his constant attendant (*cf.* Acts xvi. 1–3), Titus, a born Gentile, must have become Paul's "very own child" (Titus i. 4) in the common faith of the gospel. This is obvious if, with most modern scholars, we identify the visit of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem recorded in Acts xv. with the visit mentioned in Galatians ii. From the latter we learn that Titus, as a Greek, was not circumcised,

[1] Köhler, in *Herzog's Encl.*, shows the extreme arbitrariness of Märcker's identification of Titus with Silas. *Cf.* 2 Cor. i. 19 with 2 Cor. ii. 13.

and that Paul refused to revoke, in his case, a privilege which Peter at the beginning of the gospel had accorded to Cornelius. This refusal of the Apostle, in the heat of the angry controversy with the Judaizers, conferred an invidious distinction on Titus, who apparently had come up to Jerusalem to press the arguments and try the case of religious equality. His toughness of nature and strength of character enabled him to sustain the conflict, which was fought out in his own person. We can only conjecture his previous history. From this time onward he was one of the most trusted and doughty servants of the Apostle. Titus probably accompanied St. Paul on some portions of his second missionary journey (Acts xv. 36–xviii. 22); and from the familiar reference in the Galatian Letter to the circumstance of his non-circumcision, we presume that he was well known to the Churches in Galatia. He may have been left for a while in Ancyra, and have been the identical Church officer and minister to whom St. Paul refers (Gal. iii. 5) as administering the Spirit and working mighty deeds among them. However that may be, Titus followed Paul to Ephesus on his second visit, and witnessed all the intensity of the apostolic zeal, which Paul did not hesitate to review in detail (Acts xx. 17–35). His devoted conduct, self-possession, and wise management of men, were Paul's reasons for making Titus the bearer of his First Epistle to the Corinthians. By 1 Corinthians xvi. 10–12, Timothy and Apollos are excluded from the company of those who bore that solemn communication.

In 1 Corinthians xvi. 11 the bearers of the Epistle are described as "the brethren;" and in 2 Corinthians

xii. 18 they appear to be referred to as "Titus and the brother," who on this first visit had to enforce the rebukes of St. Paul, and press for the "collection." Timothy had quieter and more gentle work to do at Corinth, and was sent, almost contemporaneously (see Acts xix. 22), on some other missions. The Corinthians were told not to frighten him, nor to despise him; and they were enjoined, moreover, neither to detain him, nor to divert him from his purpose. Timothy was to accompany "the brethren," and in their society to rejoin the Apostle. The tone of apology, stimulating suggestion, and fatherly counsel manifested towards his son Timothy differs greatly from the manner of every reference to Titus, who evidently could take care of himself, and be safely entrusted with intricate, difficult, and delicate negotiations. St. Paul appears to have been more dependent upon Titus than Titus was upon Paul. He is described as the Apostle's "brother and companion and fellow-labourer" (ἀδελφός and κοινωνὸς and συνεργός, 2 Cor. viii. 23); and if he were the bearer of the first Epistle, and enforced the advice of the Apostle upon the Church which had for the moment been thrown into violent confusion by "that wicked person," he must have been a man of strong nerve and fine tact. Other very perplexing questions had disturbed the infant community. Factions had been formed, and the representative and bearer of St. Paul's Letter would have to meet the excited partisans of Apollos and Cephas. Their practice of carrying Church quarrels before the law courts had to be arrested; and all the angry conflict raised by Judaizers concerning the Apostle's doctrine of unclean meats, as

well as the confusions incident to the spiritual manifestations and disorderly scenes that had occurred at love-feasts and at the Eucharist, called for firm and wise dealing. Some of the Corinthians, moreover, had denied the resurrection of Christ and of Christians, and had failed to render a generous support to that apostolate to the Gentiles with which Paul and Barnabas had been entrusted by the Church at Jerusalem. The Apostolic rebukes of their sins and defects were sure to excite vehement emotion; and whether or not Titus was the bearer of St. Paul's Epistle, he was clearly commissioned to enforce its teaching, and report the result to the Apostle. Need we wonder that the Apostle was nervously anxious to learn from Titus the effect of their united remonstrance and counsel? St. Paul had left Ephesus after the uproar in the theatre: he would have liked to have made his intended journey to Macedonia by way of Corinth, but altered (2 Cor. i. 15, 16) his route, and awaited the result of the first Epistle. He made his way to Troas, and "*a door was opened there unto me of the Lord*, (but) *I found no rest in my spirit, because I found not Titus my brother*" (2 Cor. ii. 12). Finding that no Macedonian vessel which touched at Troas brought Titus to him, he took ship, and went himself to Macedonia, to abbreviate his suspense; but even then he said, "*Our flesh had no rest, but we were troubled on every side: without were fightings, within were fears.*" But at length *by the coming of Titus* and *by the consolation* (παρακλήσει) *wherewith he was consoled in* the Corinthians (2 Cor. vii. 6, 7), St. Paul was himself comforted. The ingenuity and firmness, the mingled

gentleness, loyalty, and devotion, with which Titus had discharged his most difficult task, and maintained the credit of the Apostle against the formidable odds already referred to, provide a highly favourable and vivid sketch of the character of this brother and fellow-labourer of the Apostle. Timothy was not equal to the task, Apollos declined to undertake it. Titus not only discharged it with admirable patience and success, but was ready, even eager, to go back to Corinth with the *second* Letter, and to complete the delicate service which he had commenced a year before (*cf.* 2 Cor. viii. 6 with xii. 18). Since *he had begun*, Paul desired him *also to finish among* the Corinthians *the same grace or gift.* The eager interest with which he responded to the appeal seemed like a Divine inspiration. "God," says Paul, "put it into his heart." A private letter addressed to Titus in the midst of these negotiations would have possessed great interest, but we know nothing of his proceedings until many years have elapsed.

The Apostle, meanwhile, had himself visited Corinth, and had written the Letters to the Galatians and the Romans; he had made two visits to Jerusalem, had been detained in Cæsarea, imprisoned in Rome, and had once more, as we believe, visited Ephesus, Philippi, and Corinth. Among other places, we learn from the Epistle to Titus that the Apostle had paid a visit to the island of Crete. We are not to suppose that during this visit the Churches of Crete were founded. Jews and proselytes from Crete were present at Pentecost (Acts ii. 11), and heard and saw the wonders of that day. Doubtless these converts

carried to the island of Crete, as others did to Cyrene, Cyprus, and Rome itself, the first tidings of the new faith, and of the kingdom over which the exalted Jesus reigned. At this period the island of Crete, —having, 69 B.C., been conquered by Cecilius Metellus—was associated with the *Cyrenaica*, to form one senatorial province.[1]

There was a strange blending of races and religions upon the island, and though in earlier times their principal cities had enjoyed separate government, and contended for the *hegemony* of the country with fierce animosity, yet they were capable on occasion of combining with each other, of sinking their mutual jealousies, and of presenting a united front to their common foe. From this circumstance the Greek word "syncretise" (συγκρητίσαι) came into customary use. The Cretans in the earliest times of their history adopted the most superstitious and debasing forms of heathen worship. Porphyry tells us that the practice of sacrificing youths to Cronos was introduced amongst them.[2] Clemens Alexandrinus[3] confirms the allegation. Crete kept aloof from the great conflict between Greece and Persia, and took no part in the Peloponnesian war. Their political institutions bore a superficial resemblance to those of Sparta, but there was less drill, feebler sense of order, a fainter desire for education or progress; and the Cretans in early days were accused of being "liars, evil beasts, and indolent gluttons." This report may to some extent reflect the hatred of the

[1] According to Gesenius and Knobel, Crete is the *Caphtor* of Deut. ii. 23 and Jer. xlvii. 4, though others identify Caphtor with the coast-land of the Delta. From its salubrious climate, Hippocrates sent his patients thither.

[2] *De Abstinentia*, ii. 56. [3] *Cohort. ad Gentes*, 36.

more vigorous and enterprising tribes occupying other islands in the Ægean Archipelago. It is dangerous to speculate upon the affinities of their religious ideas with those either of Phœnicia, Phrygia, or Achaia. They play an important part in the mythological history of Greece, and they boasted the possession, not only of the birthplace, but of the *tomb* of Zeus! There is no trace of either Egyptian worship or ideas among their monuments, but there is quite sufficient monumental evidence to shew the eagerness with which they had practised the orgiastic rites of Zeus, and the voluptuous abominations of the worship of Dyonysus.[1] The population in its flourishing days must have been great. Ptolemy, Strabo, Virgil, and Horace refer to the existence of a hundred cities in the island, and the ruins of many of these may still be seen. The length of the island, from Cape Salmone on the east to Criumetopon on the west, is not less than one hundred and forty miles. The narrowest part of the island is near the port of Phœnix—a spot memorable in the history of St. Paul. On his journey from Cæsarea to Malta, a violent gale appeared to be the sole reason why he and his companions were not permitted to winter at Crete. Sweeping under the lee of Crete, the captain of the vessel made for the harbour of "Fair Havens," nigh unto which was the city of Lasea; but loosing thence, contrary to St. Paul's wish and advice (Acts xxvii. 12, 21), with the hope of making the haven of Phœnix, they were caught by a north-eastern typhoon from Mount Ida, which drove them towards Clauda, and wrecked them

[1] Pashley's "Travels in Crete," vol. ii. c. 21.

on Malta. Doubtless at this very period there were numerous communities of Christians struggling, without apostolic help, into misdirected activity and theologic confusion. The mixed population of Asiatics and Greeks, characterized by indolence, untrustworthiness, and credulity, furnished fruitful soil for a rank growth of dangerous speculation, and were easy of access to any pretentious teachers who had new views to promulgate or new methods of life to suggest.

The infant Churches were in some respects in very similar conditions to that of the Christians of Ephesus. They were exposed to a similar eclectic blending of thought and manners. There was, moreover, a large Jewish population,[1] so that Christianity had all the stimulus and all the disadvantage of their eager belief and their religious pride.

We cannot affirm that St. Paul and his companions had any opportunity for pursuing their accustomed missionary work during the brief sojourn at Lasea; but he probably resolved, if opportunity should ever arise, to visit the cities of Crete, and proclaim among them the gospel of righteousness and love.

In previous articles[2] I have endeavoured to shew the extreme improbability that the Church at Ephesus, during the three years of St. Paul's residence there, could have attained the degree of ecclesiastical development referred to in the Epistles to Timothy. A similar difficulty frustrates Wieseler's hypothesis that the visit made to Crete by St. Paul and Titus

[1] The town of *Gortyna* was especially signalized as the residence of Jews (1 Mac. xv. 23.) in the letters passing between Romans and Simon Maccabæus. Moreover, Philo (*Legatio ad Caium*. 36) tells us that the island was full of Jews in his day.

[2] See EXPOSITOR, vol. i.

took place at that early part of his ministry. On the other hand, no serious difficulty arises if we accept the tradition that the imprisonment of Paul came to a favourable termination, and make the hypothesis of a prolonged period of missionary labour, concerning which the "pastoral epistles" give us the only definite hints. The references to the movements of both Paul and Apollos, and also of Titus himself, in the Epistle before us, are in themselves additional reasons for refusing to intercalate them in the midst of the Ephesian ministry. We judge that Paul (Chap. i. 5) had visited Crete and left Titus behind him, to complete his work. Now if this work included the appointment of elders "in every city," and the bestowment of various advice upon different classes, it is difficult to imagine it accomplished in less than several months of toil. The "elders" whom Titus was to ordain were to possess the qualification of being fathers of "believing children." A quiet indication is thus supplied that some length of time must have elapsed since their first conversion to Christ. Paul hoped to send (Chap. iii. 12) Tychicus and Artemas to Titus—implying a further delay—and he then urges upon Titus to join him at Nicopolis, where he had "determined to spend the winter." I do not think that Wieseler's hypothetical journey of St. Paul to Corinth, before the despatch by the hands of Titus of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, at all lightens the difficulty, but rather increases it; for this chronological arrangement clashes seriously with the very explicit mention in the Acts of a *three* years' residence in Ephesus, which would on this hypothesis be se-

riously curtailed. The three Pastoral Epistles represent a state of the Apostle's mind, a condition of the Churches, and a series of mutually consistent and closely related facts, to which they give sufficient testimony. In ordinary literature we want no better evidence for simple biographical details than the existence of such letters. We gather details from them, and are content. Whether Paul went to Ephesus on his final visit before or after his visit to Crete cannot be decisively established. The most probable supposition is that, since Paul left Ephesus for Macedonia (1 Tim. i. 3), he must have then already paid his visit to Crete; and that while in Nicopolis, where he proposed to winter, he was a second time arrested and taken prisoner to Rome. From his lonely cell, on the eve of his martyrdom, he penned his second letter to Timothy, and in that touching Epistle we find the final reference to Titus, who is said to have gone into Dalmatia. There is no reason whatever for believing that Titus had deserted his father in the faith, or that in this journey he had done other than fulfil the wishes of the dying Apostle.

In future papers we shall gather from the Letter itself some of the most mature exhibitions of the Apostle's thought, and his latest advice on the duties of the minister, the citizen, and the slave. The words of guidance and direction are addressed to one who had shewn, in various and delicate circumstances, fine tact and strong nerve, personal independence and power of conciliation. He left behind him in Crete a name and a sacred memory. The modern *Candia* claims the honour of his tomb. Two consid-

erable Churches were dedicated to him in the island, and he was regarded as its patron saint. After the conquest of Crete by Venice, the Venetians also claimed Titus, by the side of St. Mark, as their patron too. Pashley discovered a fountain, said to have been used by St. Paul for the baptism of his converts, and amid other superstitious tributes to his memory, found that the Apostle was credited with having driven the wild beasts from the island.

THE GOLDEN CENSER.

A NOTE ON HEBREWS ix. 4.

THE writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in enumerating the contents of the Holy of Holies in the Mosaic Tabernacle, mentions in the foremost place, and even before the ark of the covenant, *χρυσοῦν θυμιατήριον*, translated in our Version "the golden censer." But even if it could be shewn that any golden censer was kept in the inner sanctuary, why, it may be asked, should such a vessel have so prominent a position assigned to it? The "altar of incense," which some have supposed to be meant, is excluded by the fact that it was outside the veil, in the Holy Place, and that it was not made of gold, but, like the ark itself, was only plated with gold.

The word *θυμιατήριον* itself, as Dean Alford has remarked, may express "anything having regard to or employed in the burning of incense." May it not then have been used by this author to denote the "mercy-seat," which formed the covering (Heb. *kappôreth*) of the ark, and was its most important part?

This explanation removes every difficulty. For, first, the golden *kappôreth* was within the veil and in the Holy of Holies. Secondly, it was "of pure gold" (Exod. xxv. 17), and thus distinguished from the rest of the ark, which is next described as only "overlaid round about with gold." Thirdly, it was the most important feature of the inner sanctuary, which is therefore called, in 1 Chronicles xxviii. 11, "the "place (or house) of the mercy-seat" (Heb. *Beth kappôreth*). Fourthly, it was used on the great day of the atonement by the high priest as a censing-place (*θυμιατήριον*). Two significant ceremonies were performed by him within the veil on that day. The *first* was the burning of incense at the mercy-seat; the second was the sprinkling of the blood of the goat upon or towards the mercy-seat. Both of these acts were of a propitiatory character. As to the former, he was directed to take with him into the Holy of Holies a censer (*πυρεῖον*, LXX.) full of burning coals of fire from off the altar before the Lord, that *the cloud of the incense might cover the mercy-seat*, "that he die not" (Lev. xvi. 13). Surely it was very natural, then, that a writer so intimately acquainted with all the details of the Levitical ritual, having in his mind this very characteristic use of the golden covering of the ark on that day of atonement on which he lays so much stress, should describe it as a golden censing-place. For it was not only the sprinkled blood that gave to the sacred *kappôreth* its usual name of *τὸ ἱλαστήριον*, the place of atonement, but the offering of the incense in a cloud which overshadowed it, and in which the Divine Presence was manifested. (See Lev. xvi. 2, and Exod. xxv. 22.)

It is in favour of the above interpretation that otherwise this most prominent feature of the Holy of Holies is unaccountably passed over altogether by the writer, except in the incidental mention of it afterwards in connection with the cherubim (*Verse* 5).

J. S. PURTON.

BRIEF NOTICES OF BOOKS.

THE CAMBRIDGE BIBLE FOR SCHOOLS. *St. Mark; by Dr. Maclean* (University Press, Cambridge). In many of our Grammar Schools and High Schools, at least the elder lads are now "examined" in some portion of Holy Scripture, and have to "get it up" as they would a book of Virgil or of Homer. In a large proportion of these schools the Scripture examination is conducted by members of the Cambridge University. The examiners have found, as was natural, that, while on every other subject handbooks of the most accessible and serviceable kind abound, there is an absolute dearth of similar manuals on the several books of Scripture. Now the lads in our schools, and even the junior students of our colleges, can hardly be expected to keep a long array of commentaries on their shelves, or to be able to use them to much purpose even if they have access to them. Hence the Syndics of the University Press have decided to produce a series of the Scripture manuals of which there is just now so great a need, and have selected Canon Perowne as general editor of the series. No better selection could have been made. The name of Dr. Perowne is a guarantee for good and scholarly work; while his intimate acquaintance with the Biblical scholars of every Church and school of thought will enable him to secure the co-operation of the men best fitted to assist him.

The first volume of the series now lies before me—a small octavo of two hundred pages, price *one shilling!* It is a marvel of cheapness, for paper and type are as good as can be desired. And into this small volume Dr. Maclean, besides a clear and able Introduction to the Gospel, and the text of St. Mark, has compressed many hundreds of valuable and helpful notes. In short, he has given us a capital manual of the kind required—containing all that is needed to illustrate the text, *i.e.*, all that can be drawn

from the history, geography, customs, and manners of the time. Of course it is part of a *School* Bible, and does not trace the sequence of thought in the Gospel, or emphasize the truths taught in it; still less does it deduce and discuss doctrines. But as a handbook, giving in a clear and succinct form the information which a lad requires in order to stand an examination in the Gospel, it is admirable. Whether or not a little more should have been done, even in a *School* Bible, to indicate and emphasize the connections and transitions of thought in, for example, the teaching of our Lord, may be open to question; but so far as it goes, so far as it professes to go, I can very heartily commend it, not only to the senior boys and girls in our High Schools, but also to Sunday-school teachers, who may get from it the very kind of knowledge they often find it hardest to get.

A POPULAR EXPOSITION OF THE EPISTLES TO THE SEVEN CHURCHES OF ASIA, *by Professor Plumptre* (London, Hodder and Stoughton), is a reprint of eight valuable papers which appeared in the second and third volumes of this Magazine. It contains a wonderfully fresh and telling exposition of these Letters, which many commentators have taken in hand. Dr. Plumptre, however, has excelled them all. His monogram is likely long to remain the best and most complete study of these brief but weighty Scriptures.

ST. PAUL IN ASIA MINOR AND AT THE SYRIAN ANTIOCH (London, Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge), is another of those charming little studies in which *Dr. Plumptre* excels. It traces St. Paul from Tarsus to Antioch, Ephesus, Lycaonia, Galatia, and Phrygia; and gives us, in a lively and telling way, all that is known of the ministry of the Apostle in them. Like most of his works, the book is marked by one feature of special value to teachers and preachers of the Word. It both sets many passages of Scripture in their proper framework of circumstance, thus throwing a light upon them which makes them very vivid and fresh, and often it so retranslates them, or hints at such latent suggestions in them, as will furnish much food for thought, whether in the pulpit or out of it.

INDEX.

Rev. R. E. Bartlett, M.A.

PAGE

The Gospel of the Uncircumcision 50

Rev. Professor A. B. Bruce, D.D.

A Chapter of Gospel History :—

7. The Self-estimate of Jesus 61

8. The Gracious Invitation 142

Rev. Henry Burton, M.A.

Christ and the Samaritans 186

Carpus.

3. The Reign of Law an Incentive to Prayer 36

4. The Limits of Prayer 113

The Rich Young Ruler 229

Principles, not Rules 312

Rev. W. G. Elmslie, M.A.

The Descent into Egypt 401

Rev. Canon Farrar, D.D., F.R.S. PAGE

5. The Halacha and the Hagada 266
6. Characteristics of the Hagada 334
7. Christians in the Talmud 412

Rev. Professor Godet, D.D.

The Holiness of Jesus Christ 1, 196

Rev. J. Rawson Lumby, B.D.

The Gospel in the Epistles :—

6. The Passion of Christ 96
7. The Resurrection of Christ 383
8. Historical Summary 429

Rev. Professor W. Milligan, D.D.

St. John's View of Jesus on the Cross. 17, 129

Rev. James Morison, D.D.

Anathema from Christ 177
Prayer 300

Rev. J. S. Purton, M.A.

The Golden Censer 469

Rev. Professor H. R. Reynolds, D.D.

Titus and Crete 458

Rev. Professor A. Roberts, D.D.

That Christ spoke Greek 81, 161, 285, 307
The Apostle Philip 445